

# THE SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOL. III. No. 3.

JULY, 1910.

## THE SOCIOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF THE AGRARIAN REVOLUTION IN IRELAND.\*

A CLERICAL friend of mine told me recently of a canon of his Church who, having selected an obscure text from a Minor Prophet, opened his discourse with the frank avowal, "This passage I have never been able to understand or even to explain." I have to make a similar confession as regards my title. "Sociological" is one of those hybrid words which I suppose help to make the case for compulsory Latin and Greek; but it is not quite so easily understood of the man in the street as, for example, *electrobus*, the inner significance of which he can master for a penny. So if I use a word I do not thoroughly understand in connection with a subject I have undertaken to explain, you must remember that we are here to-night under the auspices of the Sociological Society. If their godfathers and godmothers gave them this name because it would scare away the politician, God bless their kind hearts, say I.

Failing a scientific definition of my terms, I must endeavour so to present and treat my subject that the sense in which I use them will be clear. I am going to discuss the changes which are being produced by State action and by organised voluntary effort upon the life of the people in agricultural Ireland. In order to simplify the issue, I shall omit the effect which these changes may have upon the life of Irish towns. So far, my treatment will be conventional, for ninety-nine Englishmen out of every hundred, when they talk of the Irish Question, leave out of consideration altogether the industrial and commercial communities of the north-east corner of the island—an omission which no doubt avoids awkward complications. On the other hand, I shall be wholly unconventional in my treatment of the social and economic conditions which have been created by successive British attempts to settle the Irish Land Question: for I do not regard the struggle for the land as the material or even the sordid side of the political question.

\* A paper read before the Sociological Society, April 26, 1910.

I shall divide my address into two parts. In the first I shall trace the course of the recent English legislation and try to estimate its effects upon the existing social economy of agricultural Ireland. In the second part I shall describe a movement initiated by a body of unobtrusive Irish social workers who believe that the English Land policy does no more than provide the opportunity for the building up of a stable and progressive rural social economy, by which alone could that policy be justified.

### I. THE AGRARIAN REVOLUTION.

I must present just a few, and I hope not controversial, facts about my country as I ask you to keep it in mind to-night. Ireland is an agricultural country faced, like many others in our western civilisation, with two new adverse circumstances. What in all countries is recognised to be the primary industry—what with us is economically so predominant that it is commonly called our only industry—has on the one hand to be developed against the pressure of increasing foreign competition and on the other saved from the modern tendency to urban concentration. The peculiarity of our rural exodus is that it is not a mere shifting of population. What your agricultural area loses, your urban area gains; with us, depopulation of the farm lands spells national exhaustion. As the saying is, our town is America.

I need not burden you with statistics, but the picture of the Ireland we are considering will be clearer if I give you just a few easily remembered figures. The island has a superficial area of 20,000,000 acres. One-fourth of this area the statisticians describe (in a phrase some of us might be inclined to apply to more than one-fourth of their figures) as "barren mountain, bog and waste." They mean that only 15,000,000 acres are agriculturally productive. These are divided, roughly, among half a million farms, upon which reside an agricultural population of about two and a half millions. So, if all the holdings were of equal size—which of course they never can be—the average holding would contain but 30 acres. As a matter of fact, there are over 200,000 farms from one to fifteen acres in extent. These, the homes of about a million peasant folk, are largely in the least fertile parts of the country, under a rainy sky and out of the track of trade. The island is without any important deposits of coal, iron or precious minerals; and Providence, by placing the high lands near the sea and the low lands in a great central plain, has deprived us of the water power with which our rainfall might have made some amends for the damage done to our crops and perhaps to our industrial energies.

These few preliminary facts and figures will suffice to make clear the sense in which I call Ireland an agricultural country.

Although I have excluded the industrial and commercial side of Irish life, I had better say I am not insensible to the importance of balancing the predominant agriculture with varied subsidiary and non-agricultural industries. I make, however, this reservation—that until the chief industry is modernised in skill and method, success in secondary industries will be problematical. I may now trace briefly the sequence of events which led up to the existing situation and have rendered necessary and urgent the complete re-shaping of its agricultural economy. I think you will see that the agrarian revolution through which we are passing calls also for a complete reconstruction of rural society.

Probably everyone here is familiar with the broad facts of what is called the Irish Land Question. After centuries of conflict the ownership of the land passed, as in other European countries, into the hands of a conquering race. The English attempt to colonize Ireland never completely failed or completely succeeded, and consequently there was no acceptance of the land system which was imposed by the English and which was in any case unsuitable. In 1881, after many minor attempts at a settlement, Mr. Gladstone made a bold attempt to adjust matters on an equitable basis between the owner and the occupier of Irish farms. The tenant was given the right to get his rent fixed, and to have it re-fixed every fifteen years, by an independent tribunal, the Land Commission. As long as he paid the "fair rent" (as it was called when fixed by this tribunal), he could not be disturbed. He was empowered to sell his interest in his holding to the highest bidder.

It might well appear that, whatever the landlord might think of such terms, the tenant would at least be satisfied with them. Unhappily, the priceless boon of fair rent, fixity of tenure, and free sale—the "Three F's," as they were called—only led to fresh trouble. Neither side was satisfied with the decisions of the rent-fixing tribunal. The tenant believed that contrary to the spirit and letter of the law his rent was raised to some extent on account of his improvements. Hence he did not improve, and the main purpose of the policy was defeated. It is but fair to the memory of Gladstone to say that his plan of dual ownership synchronised with a heavy fall in agricultural prices, caused by foreign competition, chiefly from the newly settled western states of America. This made the first fixing of rents appear too high. A bad system of land tenure might succeed on a rising, better than a good system on a falling, market. Anyhow, after further tribulation, the Gladstone plan was condemned. When it became clear that dual ownership was not going to repair the defects of single ownership by the landlord, small experiments were tried in state-aided land purchase which had been advocated by John Bright more than forty years ago, in order to see whether the remaining

solution, single ownership by the tenant, would succeed. The experiments were all encouraging, and in 1903 a great scheme of land purchase was passed into law. One hundred million pounds were to be advanced on loan to the tenant to enable him to purchase his holding from the landlord, and to extinguish the debt in some seventy years by an annual payment of about three-quarters of his former rent. In order to bridge over the gulf between the price which the tenant was prepared to give and the landlord to take, a further sum of twelve million pounds was provided as a free grant.

It is not to be wondered at that such terms led to business on an enormous scale; but here again Ireland met with characteristic bad luck. The 1903 scheme was based upon the expectation that the public would take the new land stock issued to finance the transfer at or near par. Owing, however, to the fall of all government securities, the new stock fell as low as eighty-five. It further turned out that the amount of the land to be transferred had been greatly under-estimated. In a new Act, in 1909, Parliament tried to get over this difficulty, with what success remains to be seen. This much, however, is universally conceded: England cannot leave this huge transaction incomplete, and in a not remote future the occupiers of the agricultural land of Ireland will be the owners. From first to last about two hundred million pounds will have been invested in this vast undertaking.

In a country predominantly dependent upon agriculture, such legislation must obviously produce enormous changes in every department of national life. There were, however, other contributory causes in operation during the period I have just reviewed which have helped to create the existing situation. The three most important of these were the popularisation of local government, the introduction of agricultural co-operation, and the establishment of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction. The first of these belonged to the British policy, the other two were embraced in the Irish movement, of which I shall speak presently. All I need say about the new system of local government was that in the greater part of the island it transferred the management of local public affairs from landlord to tenant, just as the land legislation had transferred the land.

It is surely no exaggeration to call these legislative changes revolutionary. When the land purchase scheme has worked out, agricultural Ireland will be economically, socially, and politically transformed. It is a commonplace observation that Irish rural society consists of an upper and a lower class, and many writers have held that the country has suffered from the lack of a middle class. With the abolition of landlordism the upper class falls, and Ireland will be even more than it is to-day a country mainly



of small farmers. These will own the land—the chief asset of the nation's wealth. They will have in their own hands, depending on themselves alone, the progress or decay of the nation. By their own industry or idleness, by their own knowledge or ignorance, by the way they cultivate the soil and manage the business of farming, and by the way they control local government, they will make or mar the fortunes of Ireland. Will they, can they, be expected to rise to the responsibilities which have been thrust upon them? The British statesmen who legislated away the old order are presumably satisfied with the answer which time will make to this question. Speaking as a plain thinking man to sociologists, I give it as my opinion that British statemanship has failed badly in narrowing a great and many-sided problem down to a single issue. I will now describe the movement which a body of quiet earnest Irishmen, with whom I have worked for the last twenty years, have been building up for the economic salvation and social advancement of their country.

## II. THE MOVEMENT FOR RECONSTRUCTING RURAL SOCIETY IN IRELAND.

In the year 1889, a few Irishmen, myself among them, began to consider the Irish question from a point of view, for which in the circumstances of the time it was not practicable to gain popular acceptance. They foresaw, however vaguely, how the situation, the evolution and general character of which I have attempted to describe, must work out. It needed no gift of prophecy to forecast the ultimate issue of the politico-agrarian agitation. Sooner or later the Irish farmer would become, by British law with the aid of British credit, the owner of his farm. In Ireland, more than in any other European country, the transfer of the land would profoundly affect every department of the national life. It would sweep away the whole fabric of society; but upon the ground thus cleared it would not even lay the foundations of the new social structure which would have to be erected. Nay more, every circumstance of the political achievement rendered difficult the path of the social reformer.

The new rural economy, we saw plainly, would depend for its success upon three things. First, steps would have to be taken to improve the technical methods of our farmers. Second, their commercial methods would have to be revolutionised. This would mean the application to the farmer's business of those methods of combination which under modern economic conditions are essential to commercial success—methods universally recognised on the Continent of Europe as being essential to the prosperity of rural communities, and, indeed, a condition of their survival where the holdings are small. Third, the re-organisation of

domestic and social life would have to be undertaken with the object of providing those who lived and worked upon the land with such a degree of comfort, convenience, recreation and intellectual pleasure as would furnish a counter-attraction to the lure of the city.

It is with this last essential of rural progress that we are chiefly concerned to-night, and the social aspects of the new movement have ever been the main interest of its leaders. The best of my fellow-workers were drawn into the service far more by the prospect of ultimate social improvement than by the certainty of tangible economic advantage. At the same time they recognised that, at any rate during the foundation period, they must be sternly practical in their aim and method, and that the realisation of the higher standards must depend upon a sound economic basis. In a sentence of Carlyle's I have found the spirit and working principle of the movement we elaborated to deal with the situation as we saw it, ideally expressed. "The spiritual," he wrote, "everywhere originates the practical, models it, makes it; so that the saddest external condition of affairs amongst men is but the evidence of a still sadder internal one."

The complexity of the conditions which had to be taken into account in framing our movement was, at first, somewhat disconcerting. We saw clearly the three things which had to be done: the farmers had to be taught to farm—that was the duty of the Government; and they had to revolutionise their business system, or the fruits of better farming would be divided by organised interests standing between the agricultural producer and the consumer of his produce. And then there was a better social existence to be provided. All these things were necessary. In the first the Government must take the initiative, but the other two belonged, in our judgment, almost entirely to the sphere of voluntary effort.

Perhaps our greatest difficulty arose from the English view of the correct attitude of the State towards private enterprise. It happened to be the exact opposite of the Irish, and indeed, of the Continental view. Here was a country obviously dependent for the welfare of its people upon the profits of agriculture, and yet nothing was done to increase the knowledge and skill of those who cultivated the soil and produced nine-tenths of the country's wealth. It is true that the Imperial Treasury, in an expansive mood and in defiance of the doctrines of the Manchester school of economists, allowed the entire time of one civil servant to be devoted to the improvement of agriculture. He was available for the direction and control of agricultural education in any of the 8,000 national schools which might require his services. He managed and lived upon a model farm near Dublin, where young men learned to rise above the drudgery of practical farming, and

he occasionally visited a dairy school in Cork, managed by a voluntary local committee, which got the greater part of its funds from the Imperial Exchequer. I must not forget that the English Board of Agriculture saw to it that we did not endanger the health of British flocks and herds with our live-stock imports. Meanwhile, Continental Governments, the moment they were faced, as we were, with the competition of the newly settled virgin tracts of the western hemisphere, realised the urgent necessity of preparing their farmers, mainly through education, to meet it. In the more important matter of general education, viewed in its relation to the people's lives (in this world, I mean) Ireland was at a still greater disadvantage. The co-operative organisation of the Irish farmer's foreign rivals was often encouraged by the State but was more often a spontaneous growth. But then their national education developed in them a commercial instinct and an economic sense which form no part of the mental equipment of the otherwise intellectually more gifted Irish peasantry.

Much of the backwardness of the Irish farmer is so easily explained by historical causes, by the old land system and the continued neglect of agricultural education, that we did not take too seriously the defects in their method of conducting their industry. There was, however, one adverse factor to be reckoned with, the full effect of which yet remains to be determined. Our people appear to be farmers rather of necessity than by choice. At home they prefer grazing to tillage; their history in their second home beyond the sea justifies the general statement that we prefer an urban to a rural existence. I have, in a book (better known for what it did not contain than for what it did) suggested that this preference was due chiefly to the Irishman's peculiar conception of his home.\* But whatever the reasons, and making all allowances for the depressing circumstances under which our people emigrated, the fact remains that, in the United States, any other occupation appeals to us rather than practical husbandry, in the choice of a career. We govern American cities, but we have not, so far, availed ourselves of the splendid opportunity which was offered in the days of the great Irish emigrations to a people agriculturally inclined. On the other hand, I myself know enough instances of Irish success from the humblest beginnings to prove the capacity of our people for agricultural success abroad, once they apply themselves to that calling.

The days of governmental neglect of the farmer are now, it may be hoped, ended; but it often happens that, when material grievances have been removed and their economic effects should no longer operate, an influence has been produced upon the

\* See *Ireland in the New Century* (John Murray), chap. ii.

character and mental outlook of a people which makes it extremely hard for them to respond to the removal of disabilities and the concession of remedial legislation. One legacy from the past history of Ireland was the popular belief that there resides in government a potentiality for economic development equal to its proved capacity for commercial and industrial repression. The mental and moral situation demanded, if the political agrarian situation did not render it easy of attainment, the development of a spirit of self-reliance. As I have already pointed out, the first essential was a sound economic foundation. Reason and Continental experience alike indicated a system of co-operation—that is, self-help made effective through organisation. The Irish people are strong in the associative qualities. In them there survives enough of the tribal spirit to make them prefer combined to individual activity. Here, therefore, was a definite practical work which came to our hands. We had not only to preach the co-operative principle, but to put it into practice in every branch of the farming industry.

"The Irish Homestead," the organ of the Irish Agricultural Organisation Movement (a penny weekly, which anyone interested in the problem of rural life should take in because it is edited by the foremost thinker upon the social and economic problems of agricultural communities whom Ireland, at any rate, has ever produced) gives in its current issue a picture of the situation as we presented it to the Irish farmers twenty years ago, in words which I will quote because I cannot improve upon them :—

"Irish agriculture was decaying. There were prosperous agricultural communities abroad, but very few prospering farmers at home. Irish farmers had made their own diagnosis and Irish politicians had accepted it. The diagnosis of the Irish farmer was incomplete, as he was suffering from a complication of economic diseases and he only knew the name of one. He thought, and he convinced public men, that if he owned his land all would be well with him, and the magic of property would make weeds vanish and butter to come early from the churn, the hens would lay more eggs and the cows give more milk. There is a great magic in property, and within the limits of a farmer's knowledge ownership of his land does set his thought on the better farming of that land. But the Irish farmer was suffering from economic troubles of another kind which he could not diagnose. Prices of produce were falling, and he did not know why, and it became obvious to some observers that even if the Irish farmer paid no rent at all he would still remain miserably poor. The foreign farmer sold in our markets and flourished on the prices he received. Both had the same markets.

One set of producers grew prosperous, the other set, nearer to those markets, could not make farming pay. It was not merely a question of rent, because the foreign farmer often paid as much rent as the Irish farmers did. It was a question of business organisation. The modern world had turned away from the old methods of doing business. The large factory had replaced the home industry. Everywhere there were combinations to effect economies in production and trade. It was realised that in business the biggest battalions have most chance of winning, and the individual, unless he had a huge capital, was out of the running. Trusts and combines were springing up everywhere. Wholesale provision dealers wanted to buy in a wholesale way as well as sell in a wholesale way. They could not be bothered with the few pounds of butter made by the small farmer or with his wife's weekly dozen or so of eggs. The expense of collection was too great. They wanted to buy butter and eggs by the ton, and they wanted to deal with agricultural producers who could supply them with large quantities of farm produce graded in the way they wanted, always uniform in quality, so that they in their turn could sell it with the same confidence as a first-rate manufacturer of watches can advertise his time-keepers as always being true to the minute. The foreign farmer met the wholesale provision merchant. The foreign farmer has organised his business. In association with other farmers he bought, manufactured and sold. He studied the markets, met their requirements, and got the trade. The Irish farmer knew nothing about this business organisation of his rivals, and his business was going from bad to worse."

Such was the state of facts when twenty years ago the Irish farmers were first urged to adopt the co-operative system. The organising work was begun by a few enthusiasts and, after five years of slow progress, it suddenly became evident that the system was going to be adopted widely. Thereupon the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society, which was liberally supported by the public, was formed to carry on the work which had become too costly and onerous for a few individuals to continue. Summarising its achievement in the same issue from which I have quoted, the "Irish Homestead" states :—

"On its work the I.A.O.S. has spent over one hundred thousand pounds, and never was money better spent in Ireland. In the co-operative creameries alone it is admitted that the additional *gain* to the farmers through this organisation is now £400,000 a year. Regarded as a national investment this one result alone more than justifies the expenditure of the I.A.O.S.



The total trade of the movement since it began is over £20,000,000. The annual turnover of the societies is considerably over £2,500,000, and it increases year by year."

Such then is the business record of the three-fold movement—which we sometimes describe by the formula: better farming, better business, and better living. In the year 1895, shortly after the foundation of the Organisation Society, we felt that the time had come to get to work on the first part of the remedy—better farming. Relying, rightly as the event proved, upon the political influence which would be exercised by an organised body of farmers, we formed a Committee composed of men representative of every important interest in Ireland, irrespective of party and creed. This was the Recess Committee, so called because the number of the Members of Parliament upon it made it necessary to meet in the parliamentary recess. It was the first of the round-table conferences which have become popular in the last few years. The Committee met to discuss how far and in what way, under the existing constitutional arrangements, which obviously could not be materially changed for some years, we could obtain for our workers, both urban and rural, the kind of assistance which Continental Governments had conceded to backward communities. In addition to a good deal of study at home, an inquiry was made by special commissioners in nine European countries. After a year of deliberation upon the information collected, a report, unanimously signed, was presented to the most constructive, and least understood, of all Irish Chief Secretaries, Mr. Gerald Balfour. He at once set himself to elaborate a scheme for giving effect to the Committee's recommendations. Seizing the first parliamentary opportunity, he was able in the year 1899 to make an addition to the machinery of Irish government which was far superior to anything the Committee had hoped to obtain. In the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, we have now in Ireland the means of raising our agriculture to a Continental level of technical efficiency, just as, in the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society we have an agency well fitted to re-organise the commercial side of the farmer's industry upon co-operative lines.

It would be outside the scope of this address to give you any description of the constitution, aims, or work of the department; but this much I must tell you about it: it is founded upon three principles which governed every successful body of the kind which came within the Recess Committee's investigations:—education, representation, co-operation. The interference of the State with the people's business is, as far as possible, confined to education—interpreted, of course, in the widest sense. Most of the department's work is done in conjunction with representative local bodies,

who have to contribute towards it from the rates. They further have to take part in the initiation of the work affecting their area, and administer it, subject to the supervision of the central body; and the central body is controlled, more than any other institution in these islands, by a deliberative council and two boards, which are, as to two-thirds of their members, popularly elected. I may mention in passing that a very real advance in political development was thus a by-product of the movement we had founded originally upon the organisation of voluntary effort. Furthermore I may add that my experience, as working head of the department for its first seven years, proved beyond all question that the development of agriculture on its scientific side, which is the province of the Government, depends absolutely upon the degree in which the farmers learn to develop the business side of the industry through co-operative organisation.

There remains the third part of our programme—a better living upon the farm. Here again it is as true as in the case of improved husbandry that agricultural co-operation is the surest means to the end in view. A co-operative business association has much to commend it to the social reformer. It brings to the front a new type of local leader, not the best talker, but the man who enables him to make some slight contribution to the welfare of the community. Moreover, in virtue of the more human constitution and procedure which distinguishes the co-operative society from the joint-stock company, the former demands as a condition of its business success the exercise of certain social qualities of inestimable value to the community life. Perhaps this is why, where men and women have learned to come together in the business of their lives, and have profited thereby, they are easily induced to use their organisation for social and intellectual purposes.

You will, I am sure, understand that I have no desire to exaggerate the achievement of my Irish friends in the economic and social movement whose objects, aims and method I have described. Their practical accomplishment is not inconsiderable, but, looking back over the twenty years of struggle against difficulties which similar movements have had to meet elsewhere, I feel that one moral gain to the country has been won the potential value of which it would be hard to measure. When these men began, against active opposition, and still worse chilling apathy, to preach the doctrine of self-help, their great difficulty was to gain acceptance for the co-operative principle. Now the agricultural organiser does not have to explain or commend the principle, but merely to show the farmers how to apply it, and to stimulate in them the enterprise, patience, and perseverance needed to make it succeed.

I cannot trespass further upon your time to-night, but I may

say in conclusion that in my view the particular issue I have discussed has a far wider than a merely Irish interest and importance. Ireland has been forced by the Imperial Parliament to face, and attempt to solve, a problem which some thinkers are beginning to see is clamant for solution among the English-speaking communities of the British Empire and the United States.\* If we in Ireland show a capacity to grasp and meet the needs of the social and economic situation created for us by the action of the State, we shall be making a contribution to thought which will have an immense value to the civilisation to which we belong. You will say, "How like Ireland—so large abroad, so small at home." Well, I agree, but better thus than the other way.

HORACE PLUNKETT.

\* I have developed the analogies between the rural situations in Ireland and America in a short treatise, *The Rural Life Problem of the United States* (Macmillan).

## LIBERTY—EQUALITY—FRATERNITY.

THE lucky inventors of this phrase thought doubtless that they were formulating a programme. In reality they were stating a problem of which the first two may be said to have been the terms, the last the solution. Already there were those who, like Burke, argued that equality was incompatible with liberty, and their vaticinations seemed to be confirmed by the opposite but corroborative experience of France and England. Accepting the ideal of equality France was in the end forced to purchase it at the expense of liberty. Accepting the idea of liberty English society, both then and since, has offered the very type of inequality.

The strange thing is that in spite of the clear recognition of this paradoxical result, and of the limitations of their own one-sided ideal which it involves, there should still be those who persist in conceiving of these two necessary elements in any sane ideal of human life as necessarily opposed. This is only possible by permitting the mental outlook to be obstructed by habits and interests which shut out the vision of that fuller freedom of which equality is not the antithesis but a necessary element. The beginning of a new order of social ideas, and it may be hoped therewith of social life, is the perception that the definition of liberty as consisting merely in the power to do what we like only recognises one factor in any true conception of liberty: the other is the power of carrying out purposes that in some degree reflect the fulness of human life. This wider idea is not, of course, the discovery of our own time. Religion has long recognised that life consists in the service of God and that His service is perfect freedom. Even so strong an individualist as Locke recognised that law is not necessarily the opposite but may be the condition of freedom. More recently the same idea may be said to have been the implicit foundation of Kant's, as it was the explicit foundation of Hegel's ethics. What is peculiar to our own time is the clearness with which this larger idea of freedom has come to be recognised as the ideal of all social progress. As Green put it, the claim "to be free, to understand, to enjoy," is the very breath of the modern world. That this claim can only be made effective through the spread in the different classes concerned of a spirit of true human sympathy (what the French call fraternity, what we may prefer to call good fellowship) is perhaps what has still to be realised.

It is their joint contribution, conscious and unconscious, to the more general acceptance of the positive idea of freedom that con-

stitutes the interest of the three books the Editor has asked me to notice.\* The views represented by the first two serve to state the problem by bringing the ideals of liberty and equality into sharp antagonism, the third represents a real and amazingly persuasive effort to get below the abstractions by which conservative and reformer alike are apt to be dominated.

Lord Hugh Cecil's address to the Associated Societies of Edinburgh University modestly disclaims any attempt to treat the subject in other than a superficial way. But the reader may be excused for thinking that the treatment he gives it would have been clearer even to his juvenile audience if the author had permitted himself to follow the argument a step further than he does. As it is he starts and ends with doctrines that one cannot help thinking must have sorely puzzled his more intelligent hearers. Liberty, he maintains, supposing himself apparently to be contradicting Mill, is not a right: it is only the condition of a right—the right that every human being possesses to progress in virtue and righteousness. For the rest, liberty is used in the merely negative sense of freedom from control: the "power to obey your own will and conscience rather than the will and consciences of others." It must therefore include "the power of doing what others disapprove of" as well as what they approve. Applied to property this means, as the author is not slow to note, the right to abuse as well as to use. To deny this is "destructive of property altogether, or, rather it turns the idea of it into nonsense." Liberty being, itself, thus a good, though only, it appears, as the condition of a higher good, any diminution of it must be an evil so far as it involves an interference with an order of things forthwith assumed to be "natural"; and this being so an *a priori* case is made out against the new politics of compulsion. In the case of education especially this has brought us face to face with grave national difficulties—the nemesis for interference with the natural system which depends on the just liberty of the parent to educate (or neglect) his children. The suggestion that the children have "just liberties" the sacrifice of which may be too heavy a price to pay for the putative virtue of the parent might have given pause to the argument at this point. But it is just the vice of the merely negative definition of liberty that its supporters habitually ignore potential in favour of actual claims.

Corresponding with this conception of liberty as something natural is the conception of equality as purely artificial: "an unreal delusion which never has existed or can exist"—a doctrine

\* "Liberty and Authority," by Lord Hugh Cecil. (Edward Arnold), 1910. "P. J. Proudhon et la propriété: un socialisme pour les paysans" par Aimé Berthod. (Giard et Brière), Paris, 1910. "Justice and Liberty: a Political Dialogue," by G. Lowes Dickinson. (Dent and Co.), 1908.



which again is illustrated from the judgment that has overtaken nations which, like the French, have bowed the knee to this idol. It is just because the French believed in equality that they have been prepared to submit themselves to various forms of tyranny, and in the case of subject nations have submitted others to their own. On the other hand, it is because he has never been accustomed to think of all mankind as equal that the Briton "easily, naturally, justly, humanely, places the inferior races in the station to which they belong and" (regardless apparently of the vital condition of liberty) "governs them for their own good."

This teaching naturally leads up to a criticism of Socialism, the vice of which consists in the attempt to combine the two evils of the diminution of liberty and the enforcement of a fictitious equality. Socialism can only be met by a determination on the part of the working classes to uphold the true doctrine of liberty, which, besides the other arguments in its favour, has the seal of correspondence with the divine nature, seeing that "God is the only Being in the universe He has made who is perfectly free." Fortunately this is not a theological review or one might be inclined to press the question (which can hardly have failed to be suggested to his Scottish audience) in what sense the author conceives of the Divine Being as free to do wrong and to use or abuse the universe He has made. One can imagine dim and disturbing recollections coming back to the students of the Moral Philosophy class of the profound saying of Aristotle that "the slave alone in the house is free to do what he likes."

It will be clear from these references that we have in the view of liberty set before the Edinburgh students an arrested development. It is the more surprising that the author should have stopped where he does, seeing that he admits a relative justification of the interferences with the "natural systems of liberty" in the case of education which mark the present time. Had he permitted himself to inquire what this justification is he might have been led to an analysis of the causes operating to obstruct the liberty and the development of the parental responsibility of large masses of the community which could not have failed to be enlightening. He might have been led to suspect that among these causes may be social and individual inequalities that correspond to no natural differences, but are the result of the uncritical acceptance of just the conception of liberty which is here advocated.

M. Berthod has given us in short compass a careful and sympathetic account of Proudhon's theory of property—in its starting point, at any rate, the apparent antithesis of the one we have just been considering. To those who, like the present writer, know little more of Proudhon than that he did not invent the phrase

"property is robbery," the book is full of interest. It has an excellent text in the apparent contradiction between the aphorism, which is the note of Proudhon's earlier works, and the view of the later that "in order to secure that the citizen may be something in the State it is not enough that he should be free in person: it is necessary that his personality should rest like that of the State on a portion of matter; that he should possess complete sovereignty over the public domain." M. Berthod bridges skilfully this gulf of theory by showing (1) that Proudhon throughout is chiefly concerned with peasant life, that he was "never in any true sense a citizen," while from the outset he maintains a right of "possession" as distinguished from property; (2) that he sees clearly that some limitation of the right of property construed as the *ius utendi et abutendi* is necessary in order to secure the peasant in the enjoyment of the plot of land he loves as a wife not (like the great landlord) as a mistress; (3) that after summoning the power of the State to control the arbitrariness of individual proprietors he became alarmed at the power of arbitrary interference that might be exercised by the monster he had invoked; (4) that from 1848 onwards he sought safety rather in the extension of the system of agricultural banks (which were largely his invention), of the means of communication, mutual insurance, and of industrial co-operation and organisation than in direct State ownership; and lastly that to the end he cherished the same ideal: while the land should remain the possession of those that cultivate it, any values that come from differences in natural productivity and position (economic rent) belong of right not to individuals but to the community.

The last part of the book, which is published in the International Socialist Library, puts the question in what sense Proudhon is a socialist. It answers it by distinguishing between socialists of the letter, who by pinning their faith to the formula of "the socialisation of the instruments of production" have mistaken means for end, and socialists of the spirit, who set before themselves as the supreme aim of social reform, economy of production, liberty and justice. Judged by the latter standard it is admitted that Proudhon has paid too little attention to the question whether peasant proprietorship can be proved to be economical under modern conditions.\* It is further shown that he has been misled by his Roman studies to exaggerate the liberty of the peasant proprietor. On the other hand he never swerves from the assertion of the just right of the labourer to the product of his

\* M. Berthod does not mention the light which recent experiments in co-operative farming in Ireland (largely founded on the system of agricultural credit which Proudhon was one of the first to advocate) throw upon the contentions of the great French reformer.

industry. Even in respect to liberty and economy, M. Berthod points out, it is by following out the ideas which Proudhon undeviatingly defended, particularly those of association and co-operation, that we are best able to correct his errors: "It is with the reasons of Proudhon that we part from him." Yet it is impossible to acquit him of a fundamental error in his tendency to view the right of the State in the same light as his opponents regarded the right of the individual. This, says M. Berthod, is merely to set one absolute against another. Under the influence of such an abstraction it is no wonder that extremes meet and the enemy of property joins voices with its most uncompromising supporters. "Liberty in a people," quotes Berthod from Disraeli in illustration of Proudhon's later doctrine, "always rests in the fact that there is a class in the nation able to defy despots and demagogues round which the people will always be able to rally—that is, the possessors of the land." But all this is to forget that the State in spite of detractors and alarmists is coming more and more, through the union of expert officials and popularly elected public bodies, which is the discovery of modern democracy, to represent the matured mind of the community. So far as it approaches this ideal its "interferences" will tend less and less to be any real diminution of the rights of individuals, more and more to be a furtherance of the larger liberty from which the individual himself is an outcast so long as his private interests are an obstruction to it.

It is this view of the nature of liberty and the function of the State with regard to it that underlies the best political writing of our own time. It has seldom been put in a more attractive form than in Mr. Lowes Dickinson's "political dialogue." It need hardly be said that he starts with the clear perception that nothing but confusion can come from a merely negative definition of liberty, and that there may be some things which it is far too dangerous to the general freedom to leave to the unfettered freedom of the individual. Among these he places property. "Are there idle classes? Are there criminal classes? Are there classes of unemployed and unemployable? Are there classes living on the verge of starvation and liable at the least disturbance to be shaken down among the paupers or the criminals? Are there others so rich that their whole life is one long process of demoralisation both of themselves and of those with whom they come in contact? For all this the institution of property is responsible. And upon these factors again depends the whole order of the society, its stability or instability, its progress or stagnation, its harmony or its dissonance." As the book was published two years ago and is probably familiar to most readers of this Review, it is the less necessary to describe the argument by which the writer conducts

us with his well-known skill in philosophical dialogue to his conclusions as to the profound unsatisfactoriness of the present condition of society, and the means which he thinks alone are consistent with modern ideas to bring about a better. It is enough to repeat that it is likely to rank for many years years to come, along perhaps with one or two others, including Mr. H. G. Wells's "New Worlds for Old," as one of the most persuasive books upon socialism that have been written. The reason of this is probably to be sought in this case, as in that of Mr. Wells, in the frankness with which it is admitted that no alteration of machinery will suffice to bring about a social revolution which must ultimately depend on the introduction of a new spirit of friendship into social life. But this admission transfers the question from ends to means. On what forces have we to rely to bring about the new moral atmosphere? It is here that the reader is likely to find the argument least satisfactory. We have apparently to trust to the process he calls conversion, a species of intellectual and moral illumination not only of the possessing but of the industrial classes themselves. But we have ceased to think of conversion as likely to happen, or, if it happens, as likely to be permanent, without the support of organised thoughts and sentiments—in a word, without a system of education specially directed to it. It is just upon the question of the nature of such an education that from a literary and philosophical if not a political follower of Plato we might have expected some light. Mr. Dickinson indeed mentions the subject of education, but it is only to turn away from it on the ground that "We have our own hands more than full without it." "Likely enough," we are inclined to reply, "if forsaking Plato's example you devote yourself to details instead of sticking to principle."

In another respect Mr. Dickinson seems to have been led astray by following too closely the lead of his master. From the time of Plato it has been a temptation which the sociologist who also assumes the rôle of the preacher has found it difficult to resist to exaggerate the defects of the existing conditions of things. Mr. Dickinson has not escaped. Over and over again he tells us that things are so bad, political organisation is founded on so false a principle, that nothing but a complete revolution is of any use. To this the reply is prompt that if things are really so bad how are we to explain the widespread desire and the many actual attempts to mend them? The difficulty has not escaped the writer. When Martin's attention is called to the spread of co-operation and mutual aid, of kindness and charity, of public spirit and personal affection, he is driven to reply that these "do not proceed from institutions, they are the reaction of human nature against them. They are not components of the spirit of our society but rudiments of the society that shall be." He scores a literary point, but is the distinction more than verbal? It is as though one were to say

that the power of standing and walking does not proceed from the earth but was the reaction against it. On the socialist at least one might venture to press the dilemma: either these positive forces are the outcome of something different from "institutions"—in which case the social environment cannot have the all-disposing effect which you and other socialists pretend; or they are the product of the present organisation of society—in which case this cannot be so bad as you try to make out. On either alternative the case for revolution is weakened to the extent of your admission. But it is ungracious work criticising an author who, on the whole, has told us better than any other our own dream, and is not ashamed to admit in the end that he too may have been dreaming.

It is pleasanter to return to the idea of liberty from which we started, and to emphasize the point in which we seemed to see the clue to the whole discussion. All these writers are agreed as to the value of freedom. Nor does any of them deny that we are dealing with human wills and that freedom must at the lowest involve the power of choice. It is *at least* doing what we like. The difference is that while the first writer fails to get beyond this truism, the other two recognise that this is only a formal element: a 'moment' as the Hegelian would say in the complete idea. Above and beyond the question of freedom in this sense is the question of the sphere in which it is open to a man to exercise it. The question, as it has been well said, is of the freedom *of* as distinguished from the freedom *from*. What gives value to freedom from control is the nature and extent of the world *of* which this gives us the freedom. The aim of civilisation is to extend the area, not merely of the power of choice of what we shall do, but the power of choosing the things that are worth choosing to do and that answer to real wants of human nature. It is, if we might so say: to give men the power not merely of following their *wishes* but of following their *wants*. If we ask what these wants are the only answer is, those that are represented by human nature at its fullest and best.

William James has an interesting chapter in his *Principles of Psychology* upon the place of the instincts in human life, which he ends by a suggestive comparison between the fortunate few in whom these play severally and harmoniously a part, and the unfortunate many in whom they are either absent altogether or exist only in miserable caricature. The demand to have this state of things altered in the name of justice is the central fact of our time. It is rising everywhere like a flood—to some a terror, to others a joy, to all a responsibility. The strength of Socialism lies in the clear perception it has of this fact, and the apparent simplicity of the theory it offers of what is the chief obstruction to the satisfaction of the demand. Its weakness is the remoteness of its programme as a whole from anything that is immediately



possible, and its tendency to rely upon machinery and to lend indiscriminate support to anything that bears the slightest resemblance to its ideal. The strength of its opponents on the other hand is their hold upon the *status quo* and the element of unconscious reason that works in it. Their weakness is their lack of sympathetic insight into the true source of the unrest and into what is both required and rendered possible by the conscious reason of their own time.

Meantime politics is darkened with class suspicion, while industry runs the risk of sinking from its true place as an organ of civilisation into a mere tussle between wages and profits. The thing chiefly wanted on both sides is precisely what the older reformers meant by fraternity. Fraternity is professed to-day but rather as the watchword of a party. I do not say it is not wanted among the socialists themselves. I think it is as necessary to-day as it was in the days of Lassalle that workmen should themselves unite. What I am sure is, that before this partial fraternity, when it is perfected, can attain its object it must itself receive a wider interpretation. This extension of its scope is the chief problem of the time. But it is not one that promises any simple or direct solution. It will not come through any mere appeal to the better feelings, momentarily powerful as that often may be. Our affections follow our knowledge and insight. They cannot be directly commanded. It is therefore upon the spread of knowledge of the conditions and ideals of different classes—in a word, upon social education—that the chief hope at the present time of social progress seems to me to depend.

It is just here that sociology comes in, and may be of quite decisive import in the immediate future. The question it will press on the conservative is whether he has begun to see what is wanted: whether, to use Mr. Dickinson's phrase, he has ever been converted—not to an economic theory, but to the defects of our civilisation, and the power that the modern system of government has placed in our hands to organise it on a more rational basis. On the socialist it will press the question whether he realises the truth which in however distorted a form underlies the contention of his opponent: whether he realises what is involved in his own doctrine of liberty. It is on his own showing a mode of living, a way of commanding material circumstances in the interest of an enlarged conception of life. But if this is so it is clear it can only rest in the long run on an attitude of mind, a form of individual character. What is wrong in his opponent's doctrine is not that he lays stress on character; but that he is under a misunderstanding, first as to the kind of character that is required, and secondly as to the decisive influence which circumstances acting through opportunity and suggestion may exercise in the production of it.

J. H. MUIRHEAD.

## THE DOCTRINE OF LAISSEZ FAIRE.

## I. SOME ASPECTS OF EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY THOUGHT.

SINCE the fallacy is by no means exploded that *Laissez faire* is, or rather should be, the foundation of orthodox Liberalism, an attempt to estimate its sociological significance, to link it with other phases of eighteenth-century thought, is not devoid of practical interest. If we consider the doctrine independently of this relation, we run the too common risk of separating quotation from context and thus lose a due sense of perspective.

Professor Courthope, in his appreciation of the close connection between eighteenth-century literature and politics, points out an analogy between the work of Pope and of Walpole in their respective spheres: both aimed at system and order and both perforce purchased uniformity at the cost of much that was valuable in the life and art of the nation. It must be remembered that Pope's primary aim was one of simplification. He set himself to disentangle the genius of poetry from the subtleties which distinguished the work of Donne in the seventeenth century, to stamp finally the heroic couplet handed down by Waller and Dryden as the accepted medium of poetical expression, in opposition, for instance, to the metrical variety affected by Cowley. It is best perhaps to let Pope speak for himself, though the quotations are well worn:—

Waller was smooth, but Dryden taught to join  
The long majestic march and energy divine.  
Though still some traces of our rustic vein  
And splay-foot verse remained and will remain,  
Late very late correctness grew our care  
When the tired nation breathed from Civil War.<sup>1</sup>

Such were the keynotes to poetical perfection—smoothness, correctness, polish:—

Learn hence for ancient rules a just esteem  
To copy nature is to copy them.<sup>2</sup>

Here Pope showed himself the true disciple of Addison and the 'Augustans' in his attitude towards the classical writers, and, if finally accepted, such a standard of criticism would not merely have resulted in repeated imitations of Horace and Juvenal, but would

1. Imitations of Horace. Book II, Epistle 1.

2. Essay on Criticism.

have ruled out the distinguishing characteristics of a national poetry. The poet of nature, if he could have claimed existence, would have sung *ad nauseam* of "feathered choir" and "leafy grove."

If it be permitted to quote from a work of fiction, there is a scene in Thackeray's 'Esmond' which precisely illustrates the separation of art from life, threatened by an excessive formalism. Harry Esmond, fresh from the horrors of war in the Netherlands, found Addison engaged on his poem "The Campaign," and on remonstrating with him as to the rose-coloured halo in which he was enveloping the subject, was met with the rejoinder—"I must follow the rules of my art, and the composition of such a strain as this must be harmonious and majestic, not familiar, or too near the vulgar truth."

Again, Pope's tendency to "moralize his song" was a fatal legacy to succeeding poets, for when unrelieved by his own terseness of expression and happy turn of phrase, it resulted in an unutterable tediousness. For instance, in "The Wanderer" of Richard Savage, envy is rebuked, industry extolled, and the following maxim of copybook morality is offered to the reader:—

I know thy soul believes  
'Tis hard vice triumphs and that virtue grieves,  
Yet oft affliction purifies the mind  
Kind benefits oft flow from means unkind.

"The Hermit" of Parnell was written much in the same strain, the moral being "and where you can't unriddle, learn to trust." Although instinct with a far deeper feeling and in a far more intimate relation with human life, there is the same didactic flavour in Johnson's "The Vanity of Human Wishes," and we feel that the poet bids fair to yield to the preacher when Boswell writes: "Were all other excellencies annihilated, it must ever have our grateful reverence from its noble conclusion, in which we are consoled with the assurance that happiness may be attained if we apply our hearts to piety."<sup>1</sup>

The glib orthodoxy of much of the eighteenth-century poetry appears as a loosely-fitting garment, compared for instance with the ethical feeling of such poems as Matthew Arnold's "Dover Beach" or Stevenson's "If this were Faith," in which we seem to get fragments torn from the warp and woof of an individual life and experience. It was not surprising that "the rank and file of the classicists regarded the old English writers not with absolute contempt, but with indifference."<sup>2</sup> The romantic mediæval

1. Boswell's "Johnson" (Globe Edition), p. 64.

2. Phelps: "The English Romantic Movement," p. 15.

elements of literature were incongruous in an era of enlightenment. Shakespeare was sometimes regarded as obscure and bombastic,<sup>1</sup> and, according to Johnson, Homer needed a coat of varnish at the hands of Pope before he was fit for an eighteenth-century audience. There is a delightfully characteristic passage in his *Life of Pope* in which, referring to Virgil's translation of Homer, Johnson writes: "He found even then the state of the world so much altered and the demand for elegance so much increased that mere nature would be endured no longer."<sup>2</sup> Such a rigidity of style was, however, repugnant to native individualism. Englishmen have always kicked at system and the strait jacket. Further, Pope's muse was especially adapted to the delight of the coffee-house wit, who was after all but an ephemeral figure. Satire and epigram could not finally supersede lyric, ballad and epic, which drew their inspiration from deeper and more permanent elements in the nation's life. The revolt of the Romanticists against the despotism of a Pope or a Johnson was merely typical of a movement which found expression in every department of contemporary thought. The religious and political conflicts, the literary experiments, of the seventeenth century had given place to a period of calm or even stagnation, in which emotional feeling was looked at askance, and reason was regarded as coextensive with life; uniformity took the place of variety, imitation of invention, and the steam-roller of custom flattened out any unevenness of surface. An attempt to get into closer touch with truth and nature, to substitute simplicity for artificiality, to emancipate the individual from the dead hand of tradition, marked out the revolutionary elements in literature, art, religion, and education throughout the century. In poetry the revolutionary leaven was not long in beginning to work. There seems a danger even of over-rating the extent of Pope's influence, when it is remembered that Thomson was his contemporary. The author of "The Seasons" in artificiality of language and a tendency to prosy moralising dropped into the prevalent mannerism of the time, but if he does describe a bird as a "coy chorister," he can paint storm shadows and sun gleams on an autumn cornfield with a vivid appreciation of nature, impossible to the mere "elegant" of "White's" or the "Cocoa Tree." Thomson, moreover, rejected the couplet in favour of blank verse, which was adopted later by Joseph Warton in "The Enthusiast." Warton in the advertisement to a volume of *Odes*, published in 1746, criticized severely the didactic character of contemporary poetry and proclaimed imagination and invention as the chief faculties of the poet. The inclusion of "The Grave of King

1. *Id.*, p. 16.

2. "Lives of the English Poets," by Samuel Johnson (ed. by G. Birbeck Hill), vol. iii, p. 239.

Arthur" and "The Crusade" among the poems of Thomas Warton showed the reviving interest in legend and history which was further encouraged by Macpherson's translation of Gaelic poetry, and Evans's renderings of Welsh bardic remains. Echoes from "L'Allegro" and "Il Penseroso" betray the strong influence of Milton on the work of both brothers, while Thomas Warton among others contributed to the revival of the sonnet.

The correspondence of Thomas Gray reflects more than one phase of the eighteenth-century Renaissance. His letters to Mason refer to ancient Celtic and Gaulish customs, and, writing to Warton, he speaks of Macpherson's translations of Ossian with a most unorthodox burst of enthusiasm—"I am gone mad about them." Perhaps the chief interest lies in his attitude towards natural beauty. Speaking of the Grande Chartreuse he says: "I do not remember to have gone ten paces without an exclamation that there was no restraining . . . I am well persuaded St. Bruno was a man of no common genius to devise such a situation for his retirement, and perhaps should have been a disciple of his had I been born in his time."<sup>1</sup> We seem here to have travelled some distance from the school of Pope and Johnson, and a perusal of "A Journey to the Western Islands" serves to illustrate the contrast forcibly, for the topographical survey is lightened by little emotion except of gratitude that the traveller has surmounted the difficulties of the road and arrived safely at his destination. In his later poems "The Bard," "The Fatal Sisters" and "The Descent of Odin," which were inspired by his interest in Norse mythology, Gray tended to emancipate himself more and more from classical tradition. Boswell regretfully admits that his idol was unable to appreciate Gray's genius,<sup>2</sup> and Johnson's life of the poet shows the inflexible attitude of the literary orthodoxy of the time. Writing of "The Bard," he says, "I do not see that it promotes any truth, moral or political," and he further condemns its "puerilities of obsolete mythology." In his love of nature, in his enthusiasm for ancient myth and legend, Gray foreshadows at least the age of Wordsworth and Scott.

If we turn to pictorial art for a moment, we see that the same impatience of system and convention marked out the genius of Hogarth, the founder of the English School of painting. Outside the circle of art critics, the names of native painters before this date are little known, and their place is filled by Lely and Kneller, whose monotonous specimens of portraiture occupy so large a wall-space in the National Portrait Gallery. Whatever painters there were seem to have copied foreign models. The allegorical scenes

1. Letters of Thomas Gray (edited by Tovey), vol. i, p. 44.

2. Boswell's "Johnson" (Globe Edition), p. 135.



of Verrio had also won popularity in the decorative style of painting. Both with pen and brush, Hogarth waged war against the exaggerated admiration of foreign schools, as well as against the fiat of the connoisseur and the growth of artistic prejudice:—

"What are all the manners, as they are call'd of even the greatest masters, which are known to differ so much from one another and all of them from nature, but so many strong proofs of their inviolable attachment to falsehood, converted into establish'd truth in their own eyes by self opinion?"<sup>1</sup>

Again—

"Connoisseurs have busied themselves so much with pictures and imitations that they at length in a manner totally neglect or at least disregard the works of nature, merely because they do not tally with what their minds are so strongly prepossessed with."

In his engraving, "The Battle of the Pictures," Hogarth gave a humorous expression to his antipathy to the "Black Masters." Though in the satirical and didactic character of his art Hogarth was a true disciple of eighteenth-century orthodoxy, his sturdy, almost brutal realism, distinguished him from both predecessors and contemporaries. If we turn with a shudder from "The Three Stages of Cruelty" and "Gin Lane," we must confess that "The Rake's Progress" and "Marriage à la Mode" offer a vivid picture of an age when men drank and played hard, when 'elegance' and 'polish,' to say the least, were but skin deep. In his lighter touches also Hogarth was inimitable. In the second plate of "Marriage à la Mode" for instance, the atmosphere of ennui is so skilfully suggested that the onlooker finds it hard to suppress a sympathetic yawn. The strong characterization and homely charm of the group entitled "Hogarth's Servants" in the National Gallery illustrate the truth of Lamb's criticism: "They (Hogarth's subjects) have this in them besides that they bring us acquainted with the everyday human face, they give us skill to detect those gradations of sense and virtue (which escape the careless and fastidious observer) in the countenances of those about us; and prevent that "tedium quotidianarum formarum" which an unrestricted passion for ideal forms and beauties is in danger of producing." As a painter of men and women rather than of types Hogarth stands apart, though the sincerity of his art was perhaps hardly conducive to his popularity. Mr. Monkhouse, comparing the portraits of Mrs. Garrick by Hogarth and Reynolds says: "Hogarth's picture has more spirit, Sir Joshua's more refinement. For our study we should prefer Hogarth's picture: for our drawing-room Sir Joshua's." Even Sir Joshua, he adds, was not able to make Mrs. Garrick look like a lady. Hogarth did not make the attempt.<sup>2</sup>

1. "The Analysis of Beauty" (Introduction), 1753.

2. The Works of William Hogarth. Preface by C. S. M., 1872.

As convention had both threatened to stifle poetical genius and had done duty for artistic merit before the time of Hogarth, so in the sphere of religion, Christianity during the eighteenth century threatened to dwindle into a mere empty formalism. A typical churchman of the time might best be described as theologian and controversialist. The Deist belief, which substituted reason for revelation, natural for revealed religion, was combated by men like Leland and Paley, who met argument with argument. Leland complained that Tindal, who called himself a Christian Deist, made rewards and punishments the "inseparable attendants of virtuous and vicious actions," so that, as he pathetically adds, "I don't see that he leaves God anything to do in the matter at all."<sup>1</sup> But his own work entitled "The Advantage and Necessity of the Christian Revelation shown from the state of Religion in the Heathen Antient World" has also the true eighteenth-century ring. Toland's book "Christianity Not Mysterious," was judged heretical, but Paley's arguments from the theory of design and historical evidence, and his definition of the purpose of Christianity as the establishment of "the proof of a future state of rewards and punishments,"<sup>2</sup> was equally remote from the spirit of the Founder of the Religion. Rationalism acted like a cold douche on all enthusiasm, and layman and Churchman endorsed Pope's maxim, "For Virtue's self may too much zeal be had, the worst of madmen is a saint run mad." It has been aptly remarked that the two texts on which most sermons were preached in England during the first half of the eighteenth century were, "Let your moderation be known unto all men" and "Be not righteous overmuch." Hogarth's engraving of "The Sleeping Congregation" is an eloquent comment on a society in which scepticism was "of the indolent variety, implying a perfect willingness that churches should survive though faith might perish."<sup>3</sup>

The quickening element in religious life came through the teaching of John Wesley. Though himself an orthodox churchman, he scandalized contemporary opinion through open-air services and the permission of lay preaching. He set forth love as the central principle of Christianity and declared that reason was impotent apart from spiritual sight. With the unflinching sternness of an Old Testament prophet he rebuked the easy indifference of his contemporaries. "You have not the faith *that worketh by Love* . . . . So far from it that *this* Faith is the very thing which you call *enthusiasm*. You are not content with being without it

1. Leslie Stephen: "English Thought in the Eighteenth Century," vol. i, p. 155.

2. "English Thought in the Eighteenth Century," vol. i, p. 416.

3. *Id.*, vol. i, p. 375.

unless you blaspheme it too."<sup>1</sup> Wesley was no fanatic; he demanded works as well as faith, and in an age of arid controversy his life of practical service and his rejection of religious formalism come as a refreshing contrast. "I am sick of opinions, let my soul be with Christians, wherever they be, and of whatsoever opinion they be of."<sup>2</sup>

The letters of Lord Chesterfield throw some light on the attitude of contemporary opinion as regards education. It is not surprising to read that "Classical knowledge, that is Greek and Latin, is absolutely necessary for everybody, because everybody has agreed to think and call it so." Amid much excellent advice on the art of not being a bore and kindred topics, the cult of popularity seems pushed to the verge of disingenuousness, and the impression is conveyed that "polished brass" is a more valuable commodity than rough gold. Further, eighteenth-century moderation triumphs in the assertion that true wit and good sense never excited a laugh since the creation of the world. "A man of parts and fashion is therefore only seen to smile, never heard to laugh." A very narrow gulf would appear to separate such a man of parts from a "man of sentiment" of the Joseph Surface type. It was part of Rousseau's work to let in air and light on the subject of education, and he might almost have had Lord Chesterfield's son in mind when he wrote of the polished pupil of a fashionable preceptor that "in a little time he will scarce venture to breathe except agreeably to some stated rules."<sup>3</sup> In his preface to "Emile" Rousseau advises the teacher to study his pupil: "We are not sufficiently acquainted with a state of infancy; amidst the many mistaken ideas we entertain, the farther we proceed the farther we wander from the point." The circumstances of a child should be such that he may be as natural as possible, and precept and authority should be reduced to a minimum; he must learn in the school of experience, and instead of punishment should suffer the actual consequences of an action. The importance given to outdoor life and physical exercise is extraordinarily modern, as is the stress laid on the development of the child's own power of observation. Instead of being placed in a mental forcing-house, Emile was to learn to read only when it was his own interest to do so. It is noteworthy that the book made its mark in England, for Gray in one of his letters refers to it as a striking and original example of child study.

In the world of eighteenth-century politics, the system of bribery, which has perhaps too exclusively been associated with

1. "An Earnest Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion" (1743), p. 23.

2. "Life of Wesley" (Winchester), p. 211.

3. "Emilius, or a Treatise of Education," 1773, vol. i, p. 185.

the name of Walpole,<sup>1</sup> had sapped the vitality of parliamentary life. The constitutional machine remained, but its action was dull and automatic, and could easily be manipulated by the highest bidder. With the accession of George III. the power of the Whig oligarchy was threatened by the ambition of a 'Patriot King,' and "back-stairs influence" could sway a House of Commons, described in 1759 by Horace Walpole as "like the price of stocks—Debates nothing done, votes under par, patriots no price." In 1782, there was an abortive effort at reform, but the lines of cleavage in the Whig party, the unsatisfactory character of the Coalition government, and the later questionable alliance with the Prince of Wales's faction weakened the influence of those from whom some measure of reform might have been expected, while the outbreak of the French Revolution doomed all further progress for years to come.

The "sinister interest" which lurked behind so many parliamentary measures, the jealous exclusiveness of municipal government, the ineptitude of the mass of industrial and economic restrictions, were sufficient to turn men's minds from system to no system, from the actual to the ideal, embodied in that law of nature and state of nature peculiar to eighteenth-century thought. If it were true that "*le monde va de lui même*," *Laissez faire* would then be the royal road to Utopia. In their quest of an ideal the writers of the century had looked to a law of nature, a divine order and harmony, a rational system from which men had fallen away or which they failed to realize owing to a defect in their reason or moral sense, or to the pernicious interference of positive law and institution. With them it was not a question of progress by slow stages of tentative advance, but rather a blending of the divine, the natural, and the rational in an already existing perfection. Locke was indeed the apologist of limited monarchy, yet civil government was after all but a concession to human weakness. "The state of nature has a law of nature to govern it which obliges every man and reason which is that law teaches all mankind who will but consult it, that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another, in his life, health, liberty or possessions, etc." <sup>2</sup> "And were it not for the corruption and viciousness of degenerate men, there would be no need of any other; no necessity that men should separate from their great and natural community, and by positive agreement combine into smaller and divided associations." <sup>3</sup> Harmony was the central point of Deism; it provided the foundation of Shaftesbury's optimism and the

1. "Life of Walpole" (John Morley), p. 120 seq.

2. Locke's Works, vol. v, p. 341.

3. Locke's Works, vol. v, p. 413.

argument of Pope's "Essay on Man." If it could seriously be held that the Author of Nature "has given us a moral sense to direct our actions and give us still nobler pleasures; so that while we are only intending the good of others, we undesignedly promote our own greatest private good,"<sup>1</sup> positive law would tend to become superfluous. Theology, as has already been noted, was further influenced by this belief, and Revelation tottered before the attacks of Clarke, who asserted that morality like mathematics is founded upon "the eternal and necessary differences of things."<sup>2</sup> The "economic harmonies" of the Physiocrats emphasized this line of thought, but it must be remembered that in spite of the abstract quality usually attributed to the French intelligence they kept their eye on facts.

Mercier de la Rivière in his book "*L'Ordre naturel et essentiel des Sociétés Politiques*" assumes that "la façon dont nous sommes organisés nous montre donc que dans le système de la Nature chaque homme tend perpétuellement vers son meilleur état possible, et qu'en cela même il travaille et encourt nécessairement à former le meilleur état possible du corps entier de la société." At the same time he regards force as an essential part of government, and harmony of interests is virtually put out of court when it is alleged that "cependant si nous consultations chaque homme en particulier, nous trouverions en général qu'ils voudroient tous avoir des droits et point de devoirs; recevoir beaucoup et ne donner rien."<sup>3</sup> Rousseau, after reciting the orthodox creed of justice and reason, concludes that although independent of human conventions "it can never without the aid of human institutions, be sufficient for the purposes of society, unless its influence were equal on the minds of all men and the conduct of all men equally regulated by its dictates."<sup>4</sup>

To return to English writers. Swift in "*Gulliver's Travels*" faithfully depicts just this aspect of eighteenth-century thought. Among the Houyhnhnms the general assembly substituted exhortations for decrees, "for they have no conception how a rational creature can be compelled, but only advised or exhorted, because no person can disobey reason, without giving up his claim to be a rational creature."<sup>5</sup> And even if reason had not already done her work, if perfection were not immediately realizable, if harmony of interests were not already ensured, there were writers who looked to a perfectibility which would bridge the gulf between man and his fellows. Such was Condorcet, who anticipated the moment in

1. "An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue;" in two treatises (1725), p. 124.

2. "English Thought in the Eighteenth Century," vol. i, p. 123.

3. "*L'Ordre naturel et essentiel des Sociétés Politiques*," p. 120.

4. "The Social Contract" (Eng. Translation, 1791), p. 97.

5. *Gulliver's Travels*. (Edition 1890), p. 320.



which "the sun will observe in its course free nations only, acknowledging no other master than their reason,"<sup>1</sup> and Hume in his discussion of the relative nature of Justice allowed his imagination to picture at least a state of society when "the mind is so enlarged and replete with friendship and generosity that every man has the utmost tenderness for every man, and feels no more concern for his own interest than that of his fellows."<sup>2</sup>

Godwin's "Political Justice," published in 1793, has been called the first text-book of Philosophical Radicalism,<sup>3</sup> but it would appear to be, not so much the guide to a new era of reform as the expression, or even the *reductio ad absurdum*, of that revolt against the cramping effect of system and authority which, as we have seen, ran as a connecting thread through the many phases of eighteenth-century thought, and when combined with the metaphysical conception of Nature, set up, as an ideal at least, *Laissez faire* as the political aim.

Although Godwin described the term 'following Nature' as 'loose and unintelligible,' none the less he wrote: "Human beings are placed in the midst of a system of things, all the parts of which are strictly connected with each other and exhibit a sympathy and union by means of which the whole is rendered intelligible and as it were palpable, to the mind."<sup>4</sup> And again: "Immutable reason is the true legislator and her decrees it behoves us to investigate. The functions of society extend not to the making, but the interpreting of law," etc.

"Political Justice" is the very quintessence of individualism; it bids man beware lest the delicate bloom of his mental integrity be rubbed off through the rough interference of the law or the less direct coercion of his fellows. There was ever present to Godwin's mind this danger of mental pressure, which since his time has furnished a theme to the psychologist of the crowd. Individual responsibility would fall to a lower level in a mixed assembly, he thought. "In the first place there are few men who with the consciousness of being able to cover their responsibility under the name of a society will not venture upon measures, less direct in their motives, or less justifiable in their experiment, than they would have chosen to adopt in their own persons."<sup>5</sup> The French Revolution had furnished a startling illustration of this truth to Godwin and his contemporaries, who were further impressed by the hopeless conservatism of positive institutions; they were the bar to all progress and tended to a permanent crystallization of error. Such a view may perhaps be excused, seeing what were the

1. "Progress of the Human Mind" (Eng. Translation, 1795), p. 327.

2. Philosophical Works, vol. iv, p. 246.

3. "Malthus and His Work" (Bonar), p. 12.

4. "Political Justice," (1796), vol. ii, p. 123.

5. "Political Justice" (1796), vol. ii, p. 199.

conditions of the time, when prejudice was regarded as a valuable social cement. Godwin regarded government as a necessary but temporary evil, but sharing with Condorcet a belief in human perfectibility, he looked forward to a development of reason and sympathy which would contribute to the happy euthanasia of all institutions, to the time when public opinion would guarantee the necessary measure of coercion. It is interesting to note that Godwin's individualism was not confined to the political sphere; he distrusted any form of association and considered that artistic excellence was threatened by orchestral music or the parrot-like repetition of a theatrical performance.<sup>1</sup>

It is impossible not to endorse much of what Godwin says as to the futility of governmental reforms apart from a corresponding reform of popular sentiment, as to the necessity of law being a reflection of the social conscience (though one must not attribute to him such a modern phrase). Yet so complete a gospel of *Laissez faire*, rejecting, as it did, such obvious reforms as education and vote by ballot, could be of small value to a man of affairs, except perhaps as a corrective to a too facile optimism. In his book "William Godwin: His Friends and Contemporaries," Mr. C. Kegan Paul considered "Political Justice" as in some sort an expression of the views of the Philosophical Radicals, but Sir Leslie Stephen attacked this position,<sup>2</sup> and the opinion of Monsier Gourg,<sup>3</sup> who ranks Godwin with More and Bacon, that is, with the writers of Utopias, seems best to meet the facts of the case. The influence of Godwin is perceptible enough in Shelley's "Queen Mab," but except for his psychological deductions and his acceptance of utility as the end of government Godwin's teaching lay poles apart from that of Bentham and Mill.

It has been shown that the *Laissez faire* principle which was the core of the teaching of "Political Justice," if accepted in its logical simplicity, was necessarily combined with the optimism of a passing generation, with harmony of interests or limitless human perfectibility. But deny the premises and the conclusion falls to the ground. This is not to say that *Laissez faire* has no connection with Philosophical Radicalism; on the contrary it is indisputable that repeal and reform were often synonymous terms, when the nation was divided into classes and sects, when Dissenter and Churchman, landlord and manufacturer were eager to achieve legislation in their own peculiar interest. The point is whether the writings of Bentham and James Mill can be quoted in support of pure individualism, whether the encouragement of state interference can be regarded as treachery to first principles.

GRACE KEMEYS-TYNTE.

1. "Political Justice" (Edition 1796), vol. ii, p. 495.

2. "Fortnightly Review," vol. 26.

3. "William Godwin: Sa Vie, Ses Œuvres Principales," etc., 1908.

## THE JEWISH COMMUNITY.

THE corporate life of the Jewish people for nearly two thousand years has been founded upon a communal basis. Exiled from the land in which they had developed their national life and which they had rendered sacred for all time, and dispersed in the process of ages unto the four corners of the earth, they have succeeded in preserving most of the distinctive characteristics of a separate people. The survival of these racial and national traits through endless wanderings from land to land, and through a long continued cycle of persecutions, massacres, and expulsions, is one of those strange historic phenomena that never cease to evoke the wonder and challenge the analytic power of the scientific historian. So singular and unaccountable does it seem that a people, without a territorial centre, after being buffeted about by all the tyrants known to history and broken up into countless fragments, should still conserve so many vital elements of nationality, that the phenomenon is generally attributed to the immediate favour of Providence. But there is no need to seek in the realm of the supernatural the solution of a problem which can be explained by forces and factors of a human order. Those forces were twofold, internal and external. The internal force was the attachment to a religion whose innumerable prescriptions controlled and coloured the life of every day and necessitated close congregation; the external force was the oppression which compelled the Jews to live in isolation in the various lands of their dispersion. In some countries the isolation was only social, due to the prevalence of religious prejudice and the feudal system; in other countries it assumed the concrete form of a special Jews' quarter, or Ghetto, bounded by tall gloomy walls and barred by an iron gate. The force of persecution intensified the fervour of the religious consciousness: it prevented the Jews from seeking an outlet for their activity in the general world, it deepened the foundations and strengthened the fabric of their own particular world. Within the communities in which they thus dwelt, especially in Central Europe, they enjoyed a certain measure of autonomy and consolidated their social organisation. They conserved their religious rites and customs, they developed particular institutions, and they kept alive the traditional culture, the racial consciousness, and the national genius of their people. But if instead of dwelling together in a close compact body, they had lived, or been allowed to live, singly and separately, scattered promiscuously among their neighbours,

the Jews in Europe would have lost most of their distinguishing traits and would have been largely absorbed among the nations.

As they have lived throughout the centuries of their dispersion, so, for the most part, they live at the present day—in communities. These communities are, with very few exceptions, of an urban character; those of a rural character hardly comprise more than a quarter of a million Jews altogether. They exist in every inhabited part of the globe, forming an integral factor in the social life of different countries, imbedded—as it were—in the fabric of cities, and sometimes, in Eastern Europe, occupying the greater part of a town and giving it its dominant character. In these settlements, which vary in external structure and internal character as one land differs from another, and vary at the most as the East from the West, the specific life of Jewry is nourished and sustained and proves its vitality by unceasing activity. In some the pulse of Jewish life beats more vigorously than in others. In some we find all the functions of social life in full operation, all phases of social development in working activity; in others the same phases may be manifest but in a less active form; and in others again there are fewer phases, and these may present but feeble signs of animation. Where Jewish life is most intense there the people lead a life distinct from that of the surrounding nation not merely in religious observance but in every other sphere of human endeavour and aspiration. They confine their social intercourse for the most part to themselves, they organise their own education, develop their own industries, support their own charities, pursue their own intellectual ideals, and combine occasionally for self-defence in the political arena, though into the midst of all this collective activity echoes and elements of the national life around them penetrate slowly and subtly. The fewer the phases of collective activity the weaker is the spirit of communal life, but even where Jewish life is at its lowest ebb there will be found a synagogue which provides a visible bond of union among those who still wish to remain within the fold. Where there is no synagogue nor any attempt to provide a substitute there may, indeed, be Jews, but there is no Jewish life; the Jews become so many indistinguishable atoms in the general social mass. The main variations between communities thus consist in the relative number of social functions that they manifest, and in the intensity with which these are discharged, and the incidence of these phenomena is itself dependent upon other factors.

The two principal factors determining the constitution and character of a Jewish community are the nature of the environment and the density of the Jewish population. A hostile environment inevitably tends to engender a robust communal spirit; and if there

also be a dense population the ideal conditions are present for a vigorous communal life in its countless ramifications. These ideal conditions are found throughout the lands of the East, in Asia and North Africa, as well as in Eastern Europe, which is still largely under the spell of the spirit of the East. The political despotism and religious fervour or fanaticism that characterise these regions make them a favourable soil for separatist settlements, and the centripetal force which these exercise inevitably produces a concentrated population. But in the lands of the West, whether in Europe, America, or the British Colonies, where the Jews enjoy civil and political freedom in varying degree and are not excluded by legal barriers from social intercourse with their neighbours, a certain compactness of population alone can give substance and strength to communal life. Thus, in the East the maintenance of separate communities is mostly compulsory, in the West it is entirely voluntary. Let us now examine more closely the forces that help to create and preserve these urban colonies, and the resultant conditions that distinguish those in the East from those in the West.

In the lands of the East the separate communities are survivals of conditions that have remained for the most part unchanged ever since the independence of Judaea was overthrown. They owed their establishment to radical differences of religion, to the powerful sentiment of national separateness, and to the position of political servitude, to which, with occasional intervals of clemency, the Jews were condemned by their Oriental masters. The forces that brought those communities into being in the early ages, and which preserved them throughout the mediæval tribulations, serve to maintain them intact at the present day. The religious differences, which were acutely felt two thousand years ago, have lost little of their acuteness in the process of centuries; the sentiment of national separateness has been deepened by the accumulated memories and traditions of the past, though it has long become a mere passive emotion; while the political despotism of mediæval days continues for the most part to hold uninterrupted sway and thus tends to consolidate the old-established conditions. The countries in which these conditions prevail in varying degrees contain far more than half of the Jewish people; they comprise Russia, Roumania, Turkey and its dependencies, Morocco, Persia and Afghanistan. In the Ottoman Empire the recent restoration of constitutional government has removed one of the main forces that have produced separate communities, but the effects of centuries of political bondage cannot be easily annulled, and the religious and racial consciousness are not immediately affected by political changes. In the other countries, however, the Jews still live in a state of outlawry, unrelieved by the revolutions that have taken place



in Russia, Morocco and Persia. Not only are they denied the rights of citizenship, but they are compelled to live in a separate part of the country or of the various towns, as though to accentuate their bondage. Their adversity and the instinct of mutual consolation and protection which it must foster might have been regarded as an ample guarantee of physical concentration; but their rulers have made doubly sure by enforcing their isolation by penal decrees. In Russia the Jews, with insignificant exceptions, are confined to the Pale of Settlement, where again they are limited to the towns; in Roumania, too, they are confined to the towns; and in Morocco, Persia and Afghanistan they must live in Ghettos. Debarred from any share in the national life both by legal and physical barriers they are inevitably thrown back upon themselves and concentrate their energy upon their own communal interests.

Jewish life in these Eastern countries has all the intensity and distinctiveness of the life of an independent nation. Its forms of expression are not so varied, because a subjugated people split up into countless groups, and scattered over vast dominions, is naturally limited in its modes of collective activity. In its ideas, traditions, and aspirations, in its customs and institutions, and in the character of its home life and its social intercourse, it is sharply distinguished from the country in which it flourishes. But it differs from its surroundings in external matters too, in things that can be seen and heard. He who passes through an Eastern Ghetto, whether in Morocco, or Turkey, or still nearer to European civilisation, in Russia or Galicia, is deeply struck by the feeling that he is in a strange world which has no relation to the people who live at its very gates. As he passes through the narrow, swarming streets, or across the buzzing market-place, he sees men, women and children of a peculiar ethnic type, speaking in a tongue which is not the language of the country, and sometimes clad in a costume which differs from the prevalent fashion. The strangeness of the language impresses him all the more as he observes a kaleidoscopic array of shop-signs and posters in Hebrew letters which, he learns, do not form Hebrew words. The solution of the puzzle is that the Jews, by reason of their historic migrations and communal isolation, have developed new languages or dialects of their own which are written in the characters of the sacred tongue. The most widely-spoken of these idioms is Yiddish or Judæo-German, the development of the language which they took with them from Germany on their eastward migration in the sixteenth century, which they cultivated on Slavic soil with graftings from Hebrew, and which is now spoken not only throughout the Russian Pale of Settlement and adjacent lands but also in every part of the world in which Russian Jews have settled. In the greater part of the Ottoman Empire, as well as in Bulgaria and Servia, they

speak Ladino or Judæo-Spanish, the development of the language which they carried away on their expulsion from Spain in 1492, and which they cultivated on Turkish soil, likewise with graftings from Hebrew. In Arabic-speaking countries, from Morocco to Mesopotamia, they have developed a peculiar form of Arabic; in Persia, of Persian; and in Bokhara, of Bokharan. The distinction of dress is by no means so marked or so prevalent as that of language. It is enjoined by a Rabbinic law which is ignored in the West and is falling into desuetude in the East; but Jewish law is reinforced by Mohammedan law, which insists upon a difference of costume between Jew and Moslem. In Morocco the Jews must so arrange the folds of the outer garment as to leave only the left hand free; in Persia they are not allowed to wear the *kolah*, the national head-dress. In Poland and Galicia they voluntarily wear long gaberdines and round fur hats, whilst those who belong to the sect of Chassidim also wear white socks into which they tuck the bottom of their trousers.

The enforced residence in special districts, the use of a peculiar language, and the occasional distinction of dress, are features that are common to the great bulk of Eastern communities and sharply distinguish them from Western settlements. There are two other features which they have in common, and which likewise distinguish them from conditions in the West—their homogeneity and their poverty. The population of the Eastern communities is mostly of one kind; it is a native population, sprung from ancestors who had settled there many hundreds of years before, and dating back in some cases, as in Damascus and Cairo, more than two thousand years. It is mainly in Palestine that the Jewish population comprises different elements, originating not only from neighbouring countries but also from Russia and other parts of the world, and all attracted by the potent fascination which the Holy Land possesses for the "chosen people." As for the poverty, that is a natural product of the political despotism and chronic persecution which reign over these Eastern regions and make them the special domain of the philanthropic activity of Western Jewry.

Similar in the various features just enumerated the communities of Eastern Europe differ notably from those of the Orient in some intellectual and physical respects. The former are distinguished by intellectual vitality and physical mobility; the latter by intellectual stagnation and physical inertia. The mental torpor of the East has been gradually stirred by the educational labours conducted in its midst by Western Jewry; and the immobility of its masses has also undergone a change of late, particularly in Morocco, where the ravages of civil war have inflicted terrible sufferings upon the Jews, forcing many of them to seek a home in

Algeria, Egypt, and Palestine. But mental and physical inertia are still the general characteristics of Eastern Jewry. Born and bred in the midst of poverty, in a zone where the monotony of the daily round is broken only by riot or outrage, they seem so habituated to their conditions as scarcely even to realise the possibility of rising above them, or escaping from them; whilst the unstinted charity of their brethren in the West mitigates their daily distress and soothes their recurring afflictions. On the other hand, Jews in Eastern Europe, particularly in Russia, have manifested a vigorous intellectual activity, by their production of a literature, press, and drama of their own; while their mobility is one of the most dominant factors in modern life. For close upon thirty years the current of migration has flowed steadily from Russia and Roumania westward, leaving a deposit in its course. The primal impetus was an outbreak of persecutions, but these outbreaks have now become such a normal phenomenon that the stream of migration flows unceasingly, varying only from time to time in respect of volume. The communities of Eastern Europe are thus slowly undergoing a depletion of numbers, which is not compensated by the natural increase, while it produces an upheaval in communal life. For the most part the emigrants choose their own destination; they journey to England, the United States, the British colonies, lands in which pioneers have already built up populous Jewish centres, and in which relatives and friends await them with a warm welcome. Only in a small degree is the current of emigration regulated artificially. Suitable families and individuals are transplanted to the agricultural colonies in Argentina founded by Baron de Hirsch; and emigrants to the United States are induced by favourable shipping-rates and better prospects of employment, secured by philanthropic agencies, to sail direct to Galveston and settle in the central and southern states, so as to prevent an increase of the congestion in New York, Philadelphia, and other cities on the Atlantic seaboard.

The most important feature distinguishing the communities of the West from those of the East is their voluntary character: there is no legal power that isolates Jewry from its surroundings and compels it to form an independent society. Most of the communities in Western Europe owe their origin, it is true, to a time when the Jews were treated as outlaws, both legally and socially; but now that they enjoy civil equality their continuance is due solely to an inner desire for separate existence. The spontaneous character of these settlements is exemplified most forcibly in those that have sprung up in the latter half of the nineteenth century in England, the United States and the British Colonies. The forces that have contributed to their growth and establishment have been mainly of a spiritual order: the racial consciousness

that prompted concentration of residence, and the religious consciousness that sought expression in the traditional mode of service. A supplementary cause, and one of importance, was the foreign origin of the founders of the community, which distinguished them from their neighbours and impelled them to form some sort of association, even if only for social intercourse. But foreign origin alone would never have enabled a separate community to persist; prolonged residence and commercial intercourse would soon have assimilated its members to the dominant nationality. The vital factors in the creation and preservation of the community were the historic consciousness that differentiated it from the people around it, and the religious consciousness that needed for its manifestation and cultivation the establishment of a synagogue and subsidiary institutions. The strength of these factors is shown in the size and solidity of numberless communities in the lands of freedom; and it could hardly be less in the lands of oppression, even if it were not fortified by state decrees and social ostracism. The historic consciousness and the religious consciousness are distinct and separate in the case of most peoples; but in the case of the Jews they are closely interrelated and intertwined, they reinforce one another, and thus provide a firm and broad foundation for the subsistence of special institutions. Of these, as indicated already, the first in point of time and importance is the synagogue, which not only serves as a house of prayer but also fulfils many other social functions, such as providing a place for the solemnising of marriages, endogamy being an essential factor of communal cohesion. After, or sometimes together with, the synagogue comes the school, and then follow societies for charitable, social, intellectual, professional, and even political purposes, according as the numbers and needs of the community increase and its problems develop. Communal life in the West is thus built up on a voluntary basis; it is sustained by means of a variety of institutions, partly religious and partly secular; and it is independent of the concentrated settlement which is an invariable feature of all Jewries in Eastern countries. But although this last feature is not essential to Jewish life in the West, it is found very frequently, particularly in the larger and old-established centres, which present a leading characteristic of Western communities—heterogeneity.

It has already been noted that homogeneity of population is a distinguishing feature of Eastern communities. In this respect Western communities are markedly different, for they generally comprise two main sections—the native and the foreign, the latter consisting mostly of immigrants from Russia, Roumania, and Galicia, whilst including representatives from almost every other country in the East. The native section lived in some sort of

concentration in the early history of their community, their place of residence determining or being determined by the position of the synagogue to which they had to walk on the Sabbath, and of the kosher butcher-shop whence they obtained meat fit for food according to religious law. But a rise in material prosperity would be generally followed by removal to a better district, where a new Jewish area might be created, though one differing from the original by the absence of any external token. The foreign section, however, live in a state of dense concentration and present all the outward signs of communal life in abundance and variety. Their poverty makes them settle in a poor quarter of the town, and if it be a port of arrival, such as London or New York, they make their homes not very far from the landing-stage. They reproduce the social conditions in which they have been born and bred, so far as the new environment will allow. They have been accustomed to live as one large family, sharing each other's joys and sorrows, speaking the same tongue and breathing the same air, and all revolving around the synagogue, which is for them not merely a house of worship and religious instruction but a centre of charity and of social intercourse. And although in their new homes they are free to settle wherever they please, they cannot easily break away from the ingrained habits of countless generations. They are deeply attached to the old traditional life, to the familiar sights and sounds of a Jewish city, and it is essential for their comfort and peace of mind that they shall live in the same sort of atmosphere as that in which they have grown up. The Ghetto in the East may be a symbol of political bondage; but in the West the only bondage that it typifies is that exercised by sentiment and tradition. To a large extent the modern Ghetto is necessitated by the precepts and practices of orthodox Judaism, by the need of dwelling within easy reach of the synagogue, the school-room, and the ritual bath, the kosher butcher-shop and the kosher dairy. But even for those who are indifferent to religious observances and ritual practices, residence in the Ghetto is necessitated by social and economic circumstances. Ignorance of the language of the new country, of its labour conditions, and of its general habits, customs, and ways of thought, as well as the natural timidity of a fugitive from persecution in the midst of a strange hustling people, compels the immigrant Jew to settle in the colony of his co-religionists, who are also his former compatriots or even townfolk. Among them he is perfectly at home: he finds the path to employment comparatively smooth, and if his effort to attain it be protracted he is supported in the interval by charity willingly given. But above and beyond the social, religious, and economic considerations that direct his footsteps to the Ghetto are his own racial instincts and sympathies,



fostered by centuries of struggle and suffering and stimulated anew by his release from a land of oppression.

The modern Ghetto is found in most of the large cities of Western Europe, America, and South Africa. Its widespread ramifications are a comparatively recent development, immediately due to the chronic persecution that has existed in Russia and Roumania for the last thirty years. In Paris and London, in Manchester and New York, in Chicago and Toronto, and in countless other cities of political and commercial importance, a Ghetto has arisen as a distinct, sometimes as a dominating, factor of the local community. In dimensions it is generally equal to, and occasionally greater than, its Eastern prototype, the Ghetto of New York being the largest in the world. There is more of the colour and intensity of Jewish life in the Ghetto than in the rest of the community. There is less of it than in an Eastern Ghetto, but there is quite enough to afford a vivid conception of the conditions prevailing there. Innumerable blocks of poor houses, covering a wide area, are wholly inhabited by immigrant Jews, who swarm into the streets, talking their strange guttural tongue, and sometimes still clad in the peculiar dress of their native country. The streets are lined with shops and restaurants bearing foreign names and Hebrew signs; the walls are covered with multi-coloured posters in Yiddish; the gutters are occupied by rows of stalls and barrows, laden with exotic wares—loaves of brown bread, kegs of cucumbers and olives, fried fish of various kinds and sizes, alternating with commodities for religious use, such as Hebrew prayer-books, praying-shawls, phylacteries, and eight-branched candlesticks for the Feast of Dedication in December. In the larger centres there are special market-places which present a scene of tremendous bustle on the eve of Sabbaths and festivals, when every Jewish housewife lays in a store of fish and fowl to celebrate the sacred day with fitting honours. Wherever you turn there is life pulsating vigorously, ceaselessly, tumultuously. Newsboys rush through the motley crowd, crying the names of Yiddish papers; a stringed band at a street corner discourses some haunting Hebrew melody that attracts the passers-by, who stop and listen, whilst their minds wander away to the little prayer-house in Poland where they first heard its pathetic strains; a poor woman, with a child at her breast, sings a Yiddish song of sadness; a blind man at the street-corner offers for sale the little four-cornered fringed garments prescribed in Deuteronomy; a peripatetic bookseller, with a basket of literature on his arm, proffers mediæval commentaries on the Pentateuch, religious code-books, and sensational romances; a labour leader harangues a small crowd of workmen and exhorts them to continue the fight against their petty tyrants; an unctuous missionary quotes the New Testament

in Yiddish and seeks to lure his former co-religionists to apostasy; a Zionist orator waxes eloquent over the glories of a rejuvenated Judæa. The atmosphere is charged with the Jewish spirit; the environment is studded with Jewish institutions. Synagogues great and small, houses of prayer and houses of Talmudic study, big religious seminaries that resound with boyish voices chanting the Torah, and little private schools tucked away in fifth-floor back-rooms, religious "courts of judgment" and libraries, baths, hospitals, and dispensaries, theatres, concert-rooms, and dancing halls, clubs for working-men, for boys, for girls, asylums for newly-arrived immigrants, for the poor and the aged—these and countless other institutions make up the compact variegated fabric of the modern Ghetto.

Socially, the Ghetto in the West is necessitated by the immigration of hosts of Jews into countries whose language, conditions, and modes of life are utterly strange to them. But its inhabitants are never permanent inmates: they use it at most as a half-way house, as a transitional stage between East and West. The influences from without penetrate slowly, subtly, inevitably, luring the Jew into the outer world. By dint of industry, sobriety, and thrift he reaches a position that makes him discontented with his abode in the Ghetto, and he leaves it for a more spacious quarter, where he will find more quiet and comfort. By that time he will have mastered the language both in speech and writing, and become pretty familiar with the principal conditions of his adopted fatherland. He possesses a gift for adaptability due in large measure to the hereditary effects of his people's migrations, whilst the process of assimilation is favoured and stimulated by his native co-religionists, who make "Anglicisation" or "Americanisation," or whatever else the local term may be, a cardinal principle in their communal policy. Thus the Western Ghetto is but the preparatory school in which the orthodox Jew of the East, with all his ingrained ideas, traditions, prejudices, is gradually developed into the modern Jew of the West. The actual immigrant from the East who settles in a Western Ghetto may, by reason of age or poverty, or an invincible dislike to change, remain there and die there. But his children very seldom, perhaps never do so: their modern education weakens the sentimental attachment to the Ghetto, and even though they may not have exceeded the paternal standard of income, they prefer to live farther afield and enjoy a sense of actual equality with their non-Jewish neighbours. This steady migration of the children of the Ghetto into the outer circle of the community exercises a conservative influence upon communal development, for it re-invigorates, both in the sphere of religious conformity and the general affairs of life, the Jewish spirit which is everywhere exposed to the corroding effects of a

Western environment. For throughout the lands of the Western and the Southern hemisphere the Jews who are pouring into their borders must fight the battle of life upon the economic field already occupied by the native population, and thus they are slowly assimilated to the dominant nationality. But simultaneously with the outflow from the Ghetto there takes place a regular influx from Eastern Europe, which is impelled by the forces of oppression and is bound to continue as long as those forces prevail. Nothing but the grant of complete and unqualified equality to the Jews of Eastern Europe can check the current of migration and the growth of Western Ghettos. Such an act of justice would have far-reaching and almost unpredictable results: it would ensure the material advancement of those who have hitherto been down-trodden, but it would also deprive Western Jewry of those successive bands of pietists who contribute so greatly to its conservation.

ISRAEL COHEN.

---

#### EDITORSHIP OF THE "SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW."

The Editorial Committee announces with great regret that Professor Hobhouse, who has conducted the *Sociological Review* since its foundation nearly three years ago, has been obliged through pressure of other work to relinquish the editorship. At the last meeting of the Council of the Sociological Society a resolution expressing the Society's indebtedness to Professor Hobhouse for his services to the Review was unanimously adopted. Mr. S. K. Ratcliffe, Secretary of the Society, was appointed Acting Editor.

## DISCUSSION.

## EMPIRE AND SUBJECT RACES.\*

I SHOULD first say a few words on the nature and aims of this Conference. We are not debating whether there ought to be any subject races or ruling races. We accept the facts. Much less are we meeting to attack the Government. I will tell you what the Conference reminds me of. Two friends of mine who are Governors of large provinces in the East, one in Beluchistan and one in New Guinea, both happen to have told me of a custom they have introduced in order to get better into touch with their subjects. The Governor, every Sunday morning, goes on to his veranda and sits in an easy chair reading a newspaper. If necessary he pretends to go to sleep. No officials are anywhere near him. And then any natives who have anything special to say, any unexplained trouble about which they feel shy or puzzled, come to the veranda and talk to him.

I do not pretend to carry the analogy very far. But our object is, in some rough way, to try and hear from members of various subject races and oppressed nationalities, especially those who are not allowed to speak in their own countries, something of what they suffer and what they desire, and what they have to say in criticism of their governments.

Now in these questions we English occupy a special position. In most cases, though not all, it is we ourselves who are the governing race, the heroes or the villains of the piece. That is to say, for this particular occasion we must regard our Empire in a spirit of self-criticism, not in a spirit of glorification. We come to hear grievances, to consider what errors we have committed, to think of mending the faulty points of our Empire, not of boasting and rejoicing in the good points. It will be said, I know, that as far as the speakers at this conference go, that is what they are always doing; they are always attacking the Empire and never praising it. As to that, I will only say that, if people in general were a little more ready to be occasionally and moderately critical, then we should not have to be incessantly and wearisomely so.

\* An Address delivered at the opening meeting of the Conference on Nationalities and Subject Races, Caxton Hall, Westminster, June 28, 1910.

If this nation is to do its work well, some self-criticism is absolutely necessary. We must not cavil, we must not be ungenerous to the errors of men, often great men, hard-pressed in difficult places. But if a spirit of excessive criticism is dangerous to an empire, I think any study of history will show us that empires are subject to another disease, fully as dangerous and a thousand times more common, the disease of violence and vain-glory, the disease of always siding with your own friends and preferring national pride to justice.

If you consider the work done in the world by any Imperial Power such as ourselves, you will of course find both good and evil. First, we generally establish peace, strong government, and social order: the first fundamental goods, on which all social progress must be based. Next, when in contact with lower races, we generally try to educate them, however scrappily and imperfectly, towards higher standards. If we fail to do that we fail in everything. I am not forgetting the dangers and the failures of this process; but allowing for all that, I venture to suggest that if, from the great story of human progress, you were to blot out all that has come to various peoples from contact—and compulsory contact—with higher races than their own, the remainder would be rather a miserable affair.

That is one side of the question. There is also the other. I think we may safely say, and all but the most case-hardened commercial imperialists will agree with us, that if you were, at almost any time in the last few centuries, to search through the world for the greatest crimes and the greatest miseries inflicted by man upon man, you would find them in the peoples, especially the weakest and lowest peoples, who are being governed or exploited by alien powers. The contact of a high civilization with a low is always a danger-point to humanity. [If any one thinks I speak too strongly here, I recommend him to study the history of the treatment of the blacks in Australia, in the New Hebrides, in the Congo territory, in the Cameroons, of the slaves in old days in the West Indies.]

The problem before us is, how two races, the one ruling and the other subject, can live together with advantage to both, each getting as far as possible good from the other and not injury. The problem varies, of course, in every single case. Notably it varies according to the extent of the gulf between the two races. The gulf between an Englishman and a Polynesian or a Negro is enormous: that between an Englishman and an Irishman, between a German and a Pole, is practically non-existent. Between a Russian and a Finn—well, I do not wish to-night to speak of that great crime against civilization, but if Russia is to be judged by its Government, it is easy to see there that the stronger power is on the lower side of the gulf and not on the higher. Our relations



with the ancient civilizations of the East occupy an intermediate position of special difficulty.

Now, roughly speaking, the great sources of trouble are three : first and chief, even with the best intentions in the world, there is the ordinary lack of mutual understanding ; secondly, there is commercial exploitation, when we try to make money out of our subjects instead of protecting them ; thirdly, there is a feeling of rivalry and jealousy between subject and ruler. In dealing with the lowest races this feeling of rivalry does not come in at all, whereas lack of mutual understanding is almost inevitable.

I have been reading lately the White Book of the Territory of Papua, *i.e.*, the annual report made to the Australian Commonwealth Government. It is an admirable government, and the traders are few and well under control. As you read the report of one local magistrate after another you feel that they are all acting as true Ποιμένες λαῶν, 'shepherds of their people,' always helping, tending, protecting, not destroying and exploiting and identifying civilization with the newest form of rifle. Yet in the midst of this understanding and sympathetic atmosphere, one comes again and again across the complaint "It is impossible to understand the workings of the native mind." I will give one instance. A native had confessed to a cannibal murder. Capital punishment has been abolished for such offences by the present Governor. The man was imprisoned for three years. And after two years in prison, it turned out that the man had not had anything whatever to do with the murder. He was asked why he had confessed ; and it appeared that he had confessed because he thought it was expected of him ! As far as one can make out, it was just a case of the extreme suggestibility common in savages. But we came there within an ace of hanging an innocent man, and, if we had, his relations would have resented it.

As a second instance, let me read you a passage from a letter about the state of the natives in another territory, also one presided over by a peculiarly able and sympathetic Governor. I give no names as I have not the express permission of the official who wrote me the letter.

The absorption has been going on for ten years. What of the already absorbed ? Speaking for this province I can say that the average wage-earning native is worse-fed and worse-housed than he is in his own village. The social and moral environment he inherited is destroyed. He lives under a social anarchy with crime and prostitution as the two most prominent symptoms. The laws are generally made for his master and always work for his master's advantage. I am aware of the efforts of the Provincial Commission. What chance is there of that fruit of knowledge ever being used ?

In Europe for generations we have been making laws for the workers with hands. Here, though citizenship is an impossibility for the worker, and a wide

gulf of race hinders almost every spark of kindly comprehension, law, and administration more than law, gives no protection. Elsewhere a man is encouraged to live by a few acres of his own, here no small pressure is used to make him leave his own land to work for the large landowner, often an absentee. And so through the scale of his life. The most serious fact in the country to me is that with few exceptions the natives do not believe that we are here for their advantage. The millions Britain has spent for them they don't know of. They have seen the spending, but to their mind it is spent for others. Every government institution that comes close to them, the tax, the road pass, the road making, the pressure to go to work at a distance for wages, how can they otherwise appear than as exactions? . . . . I treated the other day a native who had lost the fingers of his right hand in a maize-mill—there have been two in fact this last month. I know of an old woman the other day heavily fined for unwittingly crossing an unmarked quarantine boundary with cattle. Any of us could give dozens of cases like these.

That is the dark side of what is generally regarded as a most successful and beneficial government. The trouble there is chiefly due to the commercial exploitation of the country. And that is very often the case. As officials and governors we generally send men of high ability and high principle. We send on the whole the best men we possess. The danger of real cruelty comes not from the officials, but from the traders and adventurers and the broken men who hang upon the skirts of civilization, driven always on by the absentee master of the traders, the unconscious but ever-grasping shareholder.

If these evils can be kept down, if we keep public opinion in England always awake, and insist that English opinion, not local opinion, must always be the ultimate judge, if we send good men as officials, pay them well and do not leave them too long a prey to fever and tropical irritation, and if further we keep a firm hand upon all traders and adventurers who are trying to make fortunes out of the native, we ought on the whole to be able to make governments of this kind into bright spots and not dark in the general history of humanity.

I have spoken at some length about these lowest races, because they need always to be thought of, and they cannot speak for themselves. We are going to-night to hear about a very different kind of problem, namely our relations as a government with the old and high civilizations of the east, Egypt and India.

The worst things that occur in India seem to be due to the survival of methods of bad government dating from before our time, and no doubt allowed to continue by our lack of thorough understanding and lack of power. I mean such things as the occasional corruption of the police and their use of torture. Other bad things, not in their intention but in their consequences, are the almost inevitable results of planting a highly expensive western

government upon a people with a much lower standard of expenditure.

The present state of strain and alienation which has arisen between our Government and many of the most progressive minds of India is a deplorable thing, and one which calls for the utmost exercise of thought and patience. One thing chiefly is clear to me. On both sides of this quarrel we have able men, honest and high-minded men. We have certainly given of our very best to the government of India. I believe that India has given of her best to movements of the sort in which Mr. Lajpat Rai is a leader. (I may mention that a high official who approved of Mr. Lajpat Rai's deportation told me that there were few men in India for whom he had a greater respect.)

If we are to attain any result at all from these conferences we must all rid ourselves of many evil memories. Or if we remember the facts, we must rid ourselves of the passions and resentments that form round them. Both sides have something to forgive.

And one word more. If ever it were my fate to administer a Press Law, and put men in prison for the books they write and the opinions they stir up among their countrymen, I should not like it, but I should know where to begin. I should first of all lock up my old friend Rudyard Kipling, because in several stories he has used his great powers to stir up in the minds of hundreds of thousands of Englishmen a blind and savage contempt for the Bengali. And many Bengalis naturally have read these stories. You cannot cherish a savage contempt for anyone without its being quickly reciprocated. And when both sides regard each other with the same savage contempt, it is not likely that they can dwell together in peace. And in case Mr. Kipling should feel lonely in his cell, I would send him a delightful companion, Mr. Anstey of *Punch*. Year after year, clever natives of India come over to England at great sacrifice of money and trouble, to study in our Universities and satisfy our tests for obtaining positions in their own country. They compete with us well, and with all the odds against them. And year after year they have found in our greatest weekly newspaper caricatures of themselves—ridiculous Baboos, cowardly, vain, untruthful, in every way absurd, talking bad and bombastic English (not nearly so correct, I suppose, as Mr Anstey's Hindustani), held up for the amusement of the public. Now if these men are to be in any sense our subjects, that sort of thing is not fair play. It is not fair play, and it is not decent policy. If you must insult somebody, insult one who is free and can hit you back. If you want to govern a man, and to have him a loyal and friendly citizen—well, you must give up that luxury. You cannot govern the man and insult him too. This incessant girding at

the Bengali, the most intellectual and progressive of the peoples of India, has an ugly look. It goes along with much irritable hostility to the Congress, to the students, to almost every Indian society that professes high aims—such, for instance, as the Arya Somaj. There is in such sneers something perilously like jealousy. And if ever in a ruling race there creeps in a tendency to be jealous of its subjects, to dislike them for their good qualities rather than their bad, to keep them out of power not because they are unfit for power, but because they are too obviously fit; such a tendency is, I believe, disastrous to any empire, and the individuals and parties who foster and inflame it have forfeited their claim to stand among the great leaders and governors of the world.

GILBERT MURRAY.

## SOCIOLOGICAL NOTES.\*

THE Board of Trade has lately issued the fourth of its series of Reports on the cost of living in different countries. Those relating to Great Britain, Germany and France appeared in 1908 and 1909; the report upon Belgium is now published. It contains, of course, a mass of information which may be

**Wages and  
Cost of Living  
in Belgian  
Towns.**

regarded as being at least as trustworthy as anything available, though for purposes of comparison the figures given are not quite satisfactory. They were collected in 1908, while the figures relating to the other countries refer to the year 1905. This makes little difference in the matter of wages and hours of labour; but in regard to retail prices, the figures previously given for Great Britain require to be increased by about 2 per cent. in order to be compared with the figures now given for Belgium.

Allowing for this difference, it appears that the Belgian workman can make his income go a little further than the British workman. He pays far less for his housing,—26 per cent. less; and his food and fuel are a trifle cheaper,—about 1 per cent. On the other hand, he is very much worse off in the matter of wages and hours of labour. The average money wages of the working classes in Belgium are, in relation to those of the same classes in England, as 63 to 100; while the hours of work are as 121 to 100. It is evident, therefore, that the Belgian workman earns, on an average, very little more than half as much per hour as the British workman; and it is noteworthy that the disadvantage is greatest in the more skilled occupations. The labourers are relatively better off than the artisans. Bricklayers and masons in Belgium earn less than bricklayers' and masons' labourers in this country; skilled engineers earn about the same as engineers' labourers; and in all cases for a much longer week's work.

A LITTLE—but not much—new information on the burning question of School Feeding is contained in the Report of the Board of Education upon the working of the Provision of Meals Act of 1906 for the two years ending 31 March, 1909. During the period covered, just one-third of the 328 Education Authorities in England

**Feeding of  
School  
Children.**

\* For assistance in compiling these notes the editor is indebted to Miss B. L. Hutchins and Dr. Slaughter. The following official publications are referred to:—Report on the Education (Provision of Meals) Act, 1906 (Cd. 5131); Report on Cost of Living in Belgian Towns (Cd. 5065); Return to the House of Commons of Deaths from Starvation or Accelerated by Privation, No. 337; Census of Production, Part III (Cd. 5162).



and Wales established School Canteen Committees under the Act. The total number of meals supplied was 2,751,326 in the first year, and 9,671,789 in the second; and the total cost to the rates during the two years was £65,968. The average number of meals per child fed was only 41 in the first year, and 61 in the second,—an indication that the feeding is not much more systematic than most forms of relief during times of distress. Most of the feeding has been in the County Boroughs, of which Birmingham and Bradford have been the most active. In the latter place alone has the  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. rate been exceeded.

It is doubtful whether any inferences can fairly be drawn from the figures; the whole thing is in an entirely experimental stage. It is, however, interesting to note that the amount of money received from voluntary contributions and the amount recovered from parents are both microscopically small. In London, during the year ending 31 March, 1909, £20,494 was spent, of which £438 was subscribed voluntarily, and £40 recovered from parents. And in the whole country, out of nearly £66,000 spent, only £295 was contributed by or recovered from parents,—of which sum Bradford alone furnished £150.

THERE is always much discussion over the large number of deaths in this country which coroners' juries connect in some way with starvation or neglect; and it is right that this should be so. But the inferences drawn, especially with regard to the implied failure of poor relief and charity, are often beside the point. The return made for last year describes 125 cases in which death was due to, or accelerated by, want of proper food and attention. Of this large total, only two deaths were attributed solely to starvation, while 11 were ascribed to starvation coupled with disease, drink, exposure or self-neglect. In one or two cases there was clearly no destitution in the ordinary sense: in one a woman who died from "starvation and self-neglect" was found to have had £43 to her credit at the bank. Yet it is undoubtedly true that in the great majority of cases death put an end to a life lived under conditions which ought not to be allowed to exist in a rich civilised country. But even this assertion cannot be taken to imply definite censure upon any person or institution. More than half the cases reported are deaths of vagrants or tramps who lived a nomad life often, it is safe to say, because they resented most of the normal restraints which belong to a settled mode of existence. Such vagrants ought not to be allowed to live as they do; no doubt: but while they are allowed, it is hardly possible to prevent their deaths being as "neglected" as their lives. No hospital or infirmary can prevent, for example,

**Deaths from  
Starvation  
or Privation.**

a diseased woman-tramp crawling into a disused cowshed to die alone and uncared-for,—if such solitary nomads are allowed to wander about alone and unnoticed. Nor can the best managed Poor Law Infirmary save from death a woman who sends her husband to be properly nursed there but obstinately refuses similar help for herself. Sometimes it is urged that a greater willingness to give out-relief on the part of the Guardians would do away with many of the cases. But it is not easy to see how out-relief can be given to the frequenters of common lodging-houses and casual wards; and, among the very poor who have some sort of a home, the great difficulty of out-relief is that it not unfrequently prevents the recipient from getting the attention in serious illness which he needs. In 6 of the 125 cases described, out-relief was actually being given at the time of death, and was apparently perpetuating a condition of neglect which hastened death. Reformers of the Poor Law certainly need to deal with these cases of death from neglect and want; but the method required is probably a more difficult one than the out-relief panacea.

IN Mr. Winston Churchill's Trade Boards Act we have an experiment which sociologists will watch with interest.

**Trade Boards  
for Sweated  
Industries.**

The Act, which is avowedly of a tentative nature, applies at present to certain branches of five trades, tailoring, paper-box making, machine-made lace and net finishing, and certain kinds of chain-making. The chain-making board was the first constituted, and is the only one that has issued a determination. So miserably paid have been the home workers in this trade that the Board has been constrained to fix a wage constituting a rise of no less than 100 per cent., and even this rise will only bring the earnings of this class of workers up to 11/3d. for a week of 54 hours, less than is usually considered a fair wage for a young woman in a well-organised factory. The method adopted in fixing wages is to set up a standard time-wage, and compute piece-rates that will yield that standard wage—not to any worker, or to this particular worker, but to a worker of average skill and industry. The calculations are worked out by a board consisting of representatives of employers and employed, who are familiar with the intricacies of the trade, and with one another's point of view, however hostile they may mutually be. So far the proceedings, complicated and difficult as they no doubt seem to the outsider, are not really very different from the calculations that have to be made, somehow or other, in every industry where piece-work prevails; the difference being that the workers' representatives on the board will have more knowledge than the isolated worker can have, and will be able to demand the recognition of a "fair" or standard wage. Un-

doubtedly the difficulty of enforcement of this recognised wage will in some cases be great, and will need the co-operation of a class of workers who have hitherto been too weak to organise and fight for themselves. The most interesting feature of the whole scheme is the impulse that has been given to organisation. Many hundreds of women have been joining the unions in their trade in hopes of the strength and help that is expected from the operations of the Boards. There are bound to be set-backs. Large orders have been received by the employers of chain-makers in order to avoid the rise of price expected to ensue from the rise of wages. Employment has thus been very active, and there may not unlikely be a corresponding depression afterwards, which may be used as an argument against the system. The experiment must therefore not be judged by its first or even perhaps its second year of working. But we may well hope for success when once the scheme has had time to get into working order.

It is not, as its enemies say, a mere piece of sentimental philanthropy, but has been carefully thought out with the aid of evidence from employers and employed, and with study of the results already obtained in Australia and New Zealand. It represents one more working of the growing conviction in the mind of society that the labour contract is in its social reactions too important to be regarded as a mere private matter between employer and employed.

THE third set of preliminary tables of the Census of Production has now been issued. It contains the figures relating to 21 of the smaller industries of the country,—smaller, that is, by comparison with the great industries, such as mining and cotton manufacture, which have been previously dealt with. Perhaps the most noticeable fact in regard to these lesser trades is the quite extraordinary differences in the value of the annual output per person employed. In some trades, such as the manufacture of chemicals and drugs, or paint and varnish, the net output per person is very nearly £200 per annum; in others, such as velvet cutting or flax scutching, it is less than £35 per annum,—falling indeed to £18 in the last named trade. The very high figure reached in some industries is partly accounted for by the fact that the low cost of the actual manufacture is balanced by high costs connected with the commerce of the articles produced,—that is, with the sale and advertisement; so the producers are not necessarily making an unusually large profit. In this connection it would be interesting to know (if indeed the tables could ever include this) how much money is annually spent in the “industry” of advertising. It is clear, however, from the figures now before

**The Census  
of  
Production.**

us, that enormous sums are added to the costs of production of many articles by the advertising upon which their sale depends.

The comparison of the different trades by reference to the output per person is further vitiated by the fact that some of the trades employ mostly woman and girls, some chiefly men; some again are quite seasonal (such as the flax scutching referred to), while others are not.

Several interesting facts of great social importance are revealed by the figures given. It is satisfactory to note that the number of homeworkers in the match-manufacture is now only 117; in lace-making and hosiery manufacture the numbers are far greater,—4,113 in the former, and 4,950 in the latter. But these totals are not very high in proportion to the total number of persons employed in the trades; and it is probably fair to conclude that the process of "organising" such industries under the regular method of factory-production (the surest remedy for sweated home-work), is going on rapidly.

THE Home Secretary, some two or three years since, desired the Public Health Authorities of industrial districts to collect information on the subject of the industrial employment of women before and after childbirth and its effect on the health of mother and child. The Birmingham report has been issued and contains interesting matter. The numbers investigated were comparatively small (1,212), but Dr. Robertson, while warning his readers that deductions from small numbers are open to fallacy, considers that the statistics correspond closely with those obtained in previous investigation over much larger numbers.

The two municipal wards of St. Stephen and St. George were chosen for investigation, and in these wards the density of population is very much higher than in any other ward of the City of Birmingham. Infant mortality in St. Stephen's is higher than in any ward, viz., 211 even in 1909, which was a cool year favourable to infant life. In St. George's it is 166. The whole district is occupied by houses from 60 to 100 years old, and in 1896 inquiry revealed that 63 per cent. of the houses in these wards were back-to-back. There is great poverty, 45 per cent. of the houses visited being maintained on total incomes from all sources of less than 20/- a week, while 20 per cent. had even less than 10/- a week. Employment of mother and children as earners is characteristic of the district; 54 per cent. of the women visited went out to work. In 15 per cent. of the cases the woman's husband was out of work at the time of the visit. The birth-rate in this district was in 1908 a high one, viz., 35·8 per 1,000 of the population. After

stating these particulars in order to get the bearings, we come to the question of the employment of the mothers. The mortality of infants whose mothers were industrially employed during pregnancy was 198 per 1,000 births, and the rate among those not employed was exactly the same. The mortality of infants whose mothers were industrially employed after confinement was 139 per 1,000 births, while among those not so employed it was 225. This startling figure is partly due to the fact that most infant deaths occur in the early weeks of life, when the mother cannot be at work. Taking them all together, we find that the mortality among the infants born of mothers employed either before or after childbirth was at the rate of 190 per 1,000 births, while among those not industrially employed it was 207. We thus reach the rather curious conclusion that in a district where half the mothers go to work, the mortality of infants is rather less among the working mothers than among those not industrially employed. We need not of course draw the conclusion that the employment of mothers near confinement is advantageous—the figures do not warrant as much, and no reasonable person would maintain it. What the statistics do seem to illustrate is the fallacy of conclusions drawn from similar statistics in regard to large areas. It is unwise to assert, as has sometimes been done, that because infant mortality is higher in districts where many women are employed, the employment is the sole, or the principal, or even the major cause of the mortality. The fact is that employment of married women is usually an indication of great poverty and the insufficiency or absence of earnings by the male head of the family. Of the 611 women who worked, 556 did so to supplement a small income, 81 because it was their sole or main source of income, only 20 by preference. Poverty, again, is usually, in towns, found in connection with bad conditions of housing, as in this example from Birmingham, and the whole environment is of a nature more or less prejudicial to infant life. When we get down as near the margin of subsistence as this, the question is actually whether the tendance of the mother, or the extra food and comforts she can gain by working, is the more necessary to the infant, and the investigation reveals that *in such circumstances* the balance of advantages may be on the side of work. In Dr. Robertson's words, "in many cases the additional income brought in by the mother had an important influence in the prevention of poverty, which is one great cause of a high infant mortality. Again, a certain natural selection may have operated, many women who go to work being thrifty and energetic, and determined not to get below the poverty line, nor yet to neglect their home duties."

The practical conclusion would seem to be that measures directed to the improvement of housing and the diminution of



poverty through the regularising of employment and humanizing the public assistance granted to widows, would have a greater effect in the saving of infant life than measures directly restricting the employment of mothers. This is borne out by the table on p. 15, giving the comparative condition of children of mothers who have worked and of those who have not, and shewing that the difference is inconclusive. On the other hand the direct relation of the baby's weight to the family income is shewn on p. 18 in a very interesting table. To quote Dr. Robertson: "Whether the mother is industrially employed or not or whether the infant is breast-fed or not, if great poverty exists the infant suffers from want of nutrition, as evidenced in these average weights," and "poverty . . . alone has such an evident pernicious influence on the health of the mother and her offspring that the influence of industrial employment is to a considerable extent masked."

It is interesting to see how recent scientific developments in connection with the value of human stocks is coming to closer quarters with practical statesmanship. One of the sections of the "Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science (vol. xxxiv, No. 1) deals with heredity

**Race  
Improvement  
in the  
United States.**

and environment in race improvement, containing two important articles by Dr. Davenport on the "Influence of Heredity on Human Society" and by Mr. Alexander Johnson on "Race Improvement by Control of Defectives" (Negative Eugenics). Other sections deal with the influence of city environment on national life and vigour; obstacles to race progress in the United States, covering such matters as alcoholism and the relation of industry to family life; the relation of immigration to race improvement; and finally, the clinical study and treatment of normal and abnormal development. The essays are open to the criticism that they are too short and sketchy to have much scientific value. In regard to such matters as immigration or the influence of city environment it is better to have an extended treatment based on thorough investigation than the chance opinion even of men participating in the affairs they describe.

THE Southern States of America provide a set of factors rapidly approaching organisation which will be to the sociologist as interesting an object lesson as the growth of the Republic itself. Any careful survey like that contained in the collection of essays lately published as No. 1, vol. xxxv, of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science is therefore to be

**The  
New South.**

welcomed. Attention is given to the chief elements in southern economic life, particularly the cotton crop and its increasing manufacture in the South; the change from the old plantation system of southern labour, and with it the negro problem, to railways, waterways, ports, forest resources and conservation, and also to such matters as child labour and the present and future of politics. One notes the assured optimism of nearly all the writers, mostly representative men in southern economic development or trained social investigators in the universities. There is less attention given to the southern people than they deserve. It is more than likely that their blood and tradition will be a factor in the making of the New South equal to any of those provided by a district favoured by nature or by a practical monopoly of one of the world's greatest agricultural products.

THE latest, and on the whole perhaps the most successful, of the civic tours organised by the National Housing and Town-planning Council occupied rather more than a fortnight during the latter part of May and the beginning of June. A party of something over 70 delegates — architects, borough surveyors and engineers, town councillors, journalists, etc.—went by way of Paris and Ulm to Vienna, Dresden, and Berlin, the tour being so arranged as to take in both the International Housing Congress in Vienna and the Town-planning Exhibition in Berlin. The sittings of the Congress were mainly taken up with discussions on various questions connected with industrial housing in which the British delegates took but small part. For them the most useful feature of the visit to Vienna was the exhibition of housing schemes and garden villages which formed a good introduction to the much more comprehensive and educative exhibition arranged under the supervision of Dr. Hege-  
mann at Charlottenburg. This was of quite exceptional value, alike for the elaborate plans of city reconstruction produced by the Greater Berlin competition, and for the admirable display—in drawings, photographs, and models—of modern houses, garden suburbs, transport schemes, parks, and designs for the grouping of public buildings. It furnished the most striking evidence of the extent and vigour of the civic renaissance in Europe and America. We understand that efforts are being made to secure the greater part of the plans and views for exhibition in England, and that there is a likelihood of their being on view at the forthcoming Town-planning Exhibition organised by the Royal Institute of British Architects.

PROFESSOR CALDECOTT writes:—In the March *Bulletin* of the Brussels Institute of Sociology M. Warnotte makes a courteous criticism upon a point in my article on *International and Inter-racial Relations*.

in the January number of the *Sociological Review* to which I should like to reply. In the paragraph challenged I was noting that national character cannot be seen to be uniform in its influence upon the unifications of nations. Sometimes it succeeds, sometimes it fails; and I took the alliance of Japan and China as an instance of success, the separation of Norway and Sweden as an instance of failure. Sometimes it is strong enough to keep a people from accepting membership of a larger community dominated by an alien people, sometimes it is not strong enough for this; and I instanced Poland for the former, the French Canadians for the latter. M. Warnotte will not admit that three out of these four really illustrate my position. The alliance of Japan and China is an affair of their Governments, a diplomatic business, he thinks; the Norwegians are really different from the Swedes and their secession was natural; the French Canadians are cordial members of the Empire because they have lost their national character.

I desire to stick to my gun: I hold that I have used these instances correctly. That the national and ethnic affinities of the Japanese and the Chinese, and not only geographical propinquity, are likely to keep them in a quasi-unity in respect to all the white races I should suppose to be a commonplace of world-politics. And I think that we were most of us surprised that the comparatively small differences between the Norwegian and the Swedish characters availed to disguise from those peoples the primary need of union in face of possible perils from mighty neighbours in these times of imperialism. And as to the French Canadians I confess to amazement that a Belgian should be unaware of the manifold evidences of the persistence of an old-world French social and moral type of life and character in the inhabitants of Lower Canada. Sir Gilbert Parker is, I fear, unread in Brussels; and Sir Wilfrid Laurier's singularly interesting career as a Canadian and imperial politician must be quite unappreciated there.

As I am referring to this article I should like to add that M. Warnotte is an instance of a student of Sociology who is far from expecting that unification is to run on with unchecked force or to secure a final victory. He agrees with Tarde that Peace follows hard upon War and secures territory and unification in the wake of the clash of arms; but he goes beyond this, and imagines that in the wake of Peace and consolidation the principle of nationality will emerge again into vitality, and nations will re-form again. Nay, further, that even nations such as we see them have within

them 'regionalistic' forces at work which are only temporarily overcome by national unity: he instances Italy especially, and surmises that all our European kingdoms show symptoms of *malaise* from inner workings of this kind. For myself I cannot but think that the influences of national commerce, national literature, and other major forces of civilization show that the lines of the future tend towards increased unity, as far as our horizon at least. Beyond, we must let future students of Sociology enjoy speculations to which we have no clue.

E. J. U.

## REVIEWS.

## THE METAPHYSICS OF SOCIOLOGY.

"SOZIOLOGIE. UNTERSUCHUNGEN ÜBER DIE FORMEN DER VERGESELLSCHAFTUNGEN." Von Georg Simmel. Leipzig, 1908.

No reader of any previous work of Dr. Simmel's needs to be assured that if he sees fit to write a book of 775 large quarto pages on anything, the subject is intellectually arresting and the treatment in large measure impressive. Still, anyone but a German academic may be pardoned in the present case a preliminary shiver of instinctive protest against the disproportion between the time here exacted for the sheer metaphysics of a concrete science and the total span of human life. "A concrete science," one says, in humble and indeed almost despairing resistance to the philosophic *Weltanschauung* of Dr. Simmel. Like Kant, he insists on putting ultimate problems in the strange form, "How is . . . possible?" Kant put the question concerning Nature and Knowledge; Dr. Simmel puts it concerning Society. And in the one case as in the other there is no possible gain from the mode of the query. "What is it that we associate with the terms Nature, Knowledge, Society?" is the question really intended to be put, and the only one that can be answered. But all the fallacious implications of the term "possible" go to pre-establish our questioner in a position which never has been and never will be established otherwise.

He will have it that whereas, according to Kant, Nature is the subjective Representation thereof, it is not so with Society. "That saying of Kant's: 'Combination (*verbindung*) can in no-wise lie in the things, for they are conditioned only by the Subject,' does not hold for the social combination, which rather immediately realises itself factually in the 'things'—in this case the individual souls." If we are to have metaphysics let it be invulnerable. The "things" of Society are no more factually bound together than those of Nature—particles, animals, or planets. "The things in Nature," our metaphysician persists, "are on the one hand further separated than souls: to the union of one man with another, which lies in comprehension, in love, in common work, there is no general analogy in the spatial world, in which no existence shares divisible room with one another." What then of the hatreds of men; and what of a hive of bees; and what of  $H_2O$ ? Agreed that there are no biological analogies between the living and the non-living, what has that to do with the question as to the sense in which we know men and Nature?

Changing his grip, Dr. Simmel goes on to avow that "the things of spatial existence come in the consciousness of the observer to a unity which is not attained by the totality of individuals. . . . A number of men is *realiter* in a much higher, but *idealiter* in a much smaller degree a unity than table, chair, sofa, carpet and mirror constitute a 'room-furniture,' or river, meadows, trees and house 'a landscape,' or, on a canvas, 'a picture.' In quite another sense than the external world is society 'my idea'—that is, posited by the activity of my consciousness. For the other soul has for me exactly the same reality as myself, a reality which is very different from



them 'regionalistic' forces at work which are only temporarily overcome by national unity: he instances Italy especially, and surmises that all our European kingdoms show symptoms of *malaise* from inner workings of this kind. For myself I cannot but think that the influences of national commerce, national literature, and other major forces of civilization show that the lines of the future tend towards increased unity, as far as our horizon at least. Beyond, we must let future students of Sociology enjoy speculations to which we have no clue.

E. J. U.

## REVIEWS.

## THE METAPHYSICS OF SOCIOLOGY.

"SOZIOLOGIE. UNTERSUCHUNGEN ÜBER DIE FORMEN DER VERGESELLSCHAFTUNGEN." Von Georg Simmel. Leipzig, 1908.

No reader of any previous work of Dr. Simmel's needs to be assured that if he sees fit to write a book of 775 large quarto pages on anything, the subject is intellectually arresting and the treatment in large measure impressive. Still, anyone but a German academic may be pardoned in the present case a preliminary shiver of instinctive protest against the disproportion between the time here exacted for the sheer metaphysics of a concrete science and the total span of human life. "A concrete science," one says, in humble and indeed almost despairing resistance to the philosophic *Weltanschauung* of Dr. Simmel. Like Kant, he insists on putting ultimate problems in the strange form, "How is . . . possible?" Kant put the question concerning Nature and Knowledge; Dr. Simmel puts it concerning Society. And in the one case as in the other there is no possible gain from the mode of the query. "What is it that we associate with the terms Nature, Knowledge, Society?" is the question really intended to be put, and the only one that can be answered. But all the fallacious implications of the term "possible" go to pre-establish our questioner in a position which never has been and never will be established otherwise.

He will have it that whereas, according to Kant, Nature is the subjective Representation thereof, it is not so with Society. "That saying of Kant's: 'Combination (*verbindung*) can in no-wise lie in the things, for they are conditioned only by the Subject,' does not hold for the social combination, which rather immediately realises itself factually in the 'things'—in this case the individual souls." If we are to have metaphysics let it be invulnerable. The "things" of Society are no more factually bound together than those of Nature—particles, animals, or planets. "The things in Nature," our metaphysician persists, "are on the one hand further separated than souls: to the union of one man with another, which lies in comprehension, in love, in common work, there is no general analogy in the spatial world, in which no existence shares divisible room with one another." What then of the hatreds of men; and what of a hive of bees; and what of  $H_2O$ ? Agreed that there are no biological analogies between the living and the non-living, what has that to do with the question as to the sense in which we know men and Nature?

Changing his grip, Dr. Simmel goes on to avow that "the things of spatial existence come in the consciousness of the observer to a unity which is not attained by the totality of individuals. . . . A number of men is *realiter* in a much higher, but *idealiter* in a much smaller degree a unity than table, chair, sofa, carpet and mirror constitute a 'room-furniture,' or river, meadows, trees and house 'a landscape,' or, on a canvas, 'a picture.' In quite another sense than the external world is society 'my idea'—that is, posited by the activity of my consciousness. For the other soul has for me exactly the same reality as myself, a reality which is very different from

that of a material thing. Let Kant ever so strongly asseverate that the spatial object has exactly the same certainty for me as my own existence . . . the consciousness of the 'I' has an unconditionedness and an irrefragability that it attained by no single idea of a material externality." And so forth. With just as much conviction does the present reviewer affirm that Kant was right and Dr. Simmel wrong. The sense of "I-ness" is less unconditioned and direct than the perception of an object. It is so psychologically. The infant has perceptions before conceptions, consciousness before self-consciousness. My cognition of my own existence, of my "I-ness," is an inference, and an inference cannot be more certain than the fact of a perception. My "I-ness" is a conception finally attained through the cognition of other I's, albeit coincidentally with my sense of my selfhood. And the sense of union with the other I's is not more real than the sense of disunion.

To put it bluntly, Dr. Simmel is metaphysically "bluffing" at the start—or near the start; for he had set out with a very sound exposition of the abstract problem or function of sociology. As he puts it, this cannot be merely to record or colligate social phenomena in general: half-a-dozen specialties are already concerned with as many orders of social phenomena. The function of the new science must consist in a certain "way of regarding" the phenomena: a handling of them as social, or making for socialisation. And this brings us to the practical problem: What essentially *is* the social or society-making element in a society, and wherein does what we may term sociofaction (*Vergesellschaftung*) consist? But this problem is merely obscured by prepositing an arbitrary metaphysic by way of "*Erkenntnistheorie* of Society." "It is a rather idle question," says Dr. Simmel, "whether the inquiries into the *Erkenntnistheorie* of society which will be exemplified in these sketches, belong to social philosophy or really to sociology." Really, they might be said to belong to neither. If sociology is a science of causation in Nature, it should proceed like other sciences of natural causation, leaving metaphysic to the metaphysician. And, in view of universal scientific experience, it should be very shy of deciding *a priori* as to "what constitutes society *as such*, as a unique and autonomous form of existence." To begin by looking for essential social forms or plastic forces is to run the risk of being bogged at the start in the Platonic doctrine of ideas. But Dr. Simmel has committed himself to the view that the problems of sociology must be capable of as purely abstract a presentment as those of geometry; and he accordingly proceeds to look for causal laws, or something equally determinative, in the "forms" of Society.

He even skirts the primeval waste of the Pythagorean doctrine of numbers, devoting his second chapter to the "quantitative determination (*Bestimmtheit*) of the group." It contains much suggestive and even practical thinking about the consequences of largeness and smallness in given groups and communities. But the very preconception as to the determinative effect of number sets up positive error of statement, as when he endorses the remark that "the conservative-reactionary elements in contemporary Germany are compelled *precisely through their numerical strength* to restrain the recklessness of their tendencies: they combine so many and so different social sections that they cannot follow straight to its end any one of their predilections without evoking resistance from some set of their adherents." Here the second part of the sentence gives the true explanation, and excludes the first. Mere numbers count for nothing in the matter: the determinant is the heterogeneity; and as the Social-

Democrats increase their numbers by incorporating disparate elements they will more and more require to practise the same kind of accommodation, which Dr. Simmel in their present case formally ascribes to their numerical inferiority.

As one meditatively forces his way through discussions of this kind, there gradually falls upon him a certain hopelessness of ever reaching anywhere. One drops to a footnote upon "a typical difficulty in human relations," where the abstract and highly occult definition of the difficulty is followed by the concrete instance: "He who speaks against smoking must on the one hand himself smoke, and on the other hand he must not; for if he himself does not smoke he lacks knowledge of the charm upon which he sits in judgment; while if he smokes he incurs the verdict that he condemns himself." This "typical difficulty," to be sure, is not typical of Dr. Simmel's presentment of social problems, which is evidently the outcome of long continued thinking on the abstract significance of concrete facts; but it would be hard to specify any other gain from the performance than the mental gymnastic which it compels. And at times even the gymnastic is inadequate. What principle, for instance, is to be got from a page of instances in which numerical limits are set by edict to given groupings? The ancient Greeks had a law limiting the crews of ships to five, in order to prevent landings for piracy; and the Rhenish cities in 1436, through fear of private societies, enacted that not more than three "fellows" should wear similar clothing; and Philip the Fair in 1305 forbade any coming together of more than five persons; and so on. The inference finally reached by Dr. Simmel at the close of a chapter rich in such data, is that "it is extremely instructive that in all the determinations for which the above examples are selected, the special quality of men upon which the foregoing section treats never comes into reckoning, although it determines every single case. But it is nothing tangible, and as such remains simply number. And it is essential to recognise the everywhere deep and dominating feeling that this is the determining thing even though the individual differences of its effects do not arise—that even on that very account these effects are securely contained in the final totality of phenomena." This may be "analysis of the social existence," but it is not an analysis that throws any light upon social causation. It recalls the thesis about "the mathematics of fiction": and the vision of *tertius gaudens*, here carefully presented as one of the ponderables in the analysis of party strife, sets up uneasy reflections with regard to the people who still deny that sociology is a science.

Dr. Simmel, in short, is not concerned to explain the rise or fall, the well-being or the maladies of societies. Seeking with his metaphysical faculty to lay hold of the specific social element in all human combination, high or low, late or early, he decides that it is to be reached by some mensuration of socio-psychic states. Coming to the phenomenon of authority and subordination, he very justly treats it as one of action and reaction, citing the hypnotiser who declared that in every hypnosis there is a certain elusive influence of the hypnotised on the hypnotiser, without which the effect sought would not be attained. It is such an exchange of influences, says Dr. Simmel, that raises the simple one-sidedness of authority and subordination to a sociological form. He is satisfied, accordingly, to analyse the shades of difference in all possible reactions of the kind without arriving at any rule for action, any generalisation as to progress or decadence, risk or regimen, in historic societies. And though

his frequent citation of historic instances shows that his abstracting proceeds upon an extensive knowledge of facts, he seems always to use the actual as a stepping-stone to the abstract, never *vice versa*. Perhaps the word "abstract" may here convey a wrong impression. Dr. Simmel does not transmute social phenomena into something non-social: in his very thoughtful chapter on "The Poor," for instance, he does not envisage the poor, or poverty, as a merely biological phenomenon, or a mere case of quantitative distribution of wealth. On the contrary, he searches out very thoroughly all the socio-ethical reactions and problems set up by the presence and the claims of the poor. It does not indeed seem to be in keeping with his method to say, as he does, that no one belongs to a social category in respect of being merely poor—and that only when poverty is relieved does it "enter into a circle characterised by poverty." But whatever may be the difficulties of the enumeration, the object always is to put in view the modifications of social consciousness in varying relations. The trouble for an ordinary reader is that the author is never concerned to consider the causation of poverty as a mode of social "becoming" at different periods, the historic devices to prevent it, the theories to explain it fundamentally. Apparently Dr. Simmel would call all that mere social history or mere economics—something that does not attain to being sociology, however interesting or important in its own way.

It would be worse than rash to say that he, for his part, is not doing a solid service to sociology. He certainly makes a decisive stand—if that were still needed—against the old sort of "social science" which left all science out; that random colligation of studies of public problems which earned for the subject-matter of some of the earlier teachers of sociology in the United States the label of "drink, drainage and divorce." That stage of the science was to be explained by the fact that the professors of law, history, and economics severally warned the sociologist off their respective fields. Certainly none of them is likely to complain that Dr. Simmel is trespassing. If the successful institution of sociology consists in producing a lore that is specifically neither historical, nor juristic, nor economic, he is so far safe. But so much has been achieved by other sociologists; and the question as between their work and his is, in brief, whether sociology ought to yield a conception of societies as evolving wholes, capable of progress and decay, moral and economic rise and fall, or whether its function consists in abstractly conceiving all the variations of psychic relation which can be termed social, irrespective of time and degree of evolution.

Perhaps the outcome of the competition of conceptions will be the recognition that all ways of looking thoughtfully at society are sociological, and that all may minister to the minds of some. To many, the method of Dr. Simmel will be apt to look like that of the early physiologists who reasoned of "animal spirits," solids and fluids, and "the vital principle." Such labels are to-day bywords for spurious abstraction, and disregard of the actual. But we have seen Verworn insisting, with a good deal of acceptance, upon a return to the general biological method of Müller, which had been long abandoned for specialisms; and when "eugenics" has come to be regarded by some as not merely the end but the gist of sociology, the rigorous abstractness of Dr. Simmel may have a disciplinary part to play. He who doubts this may usefully set himself the task of answering the question, What are the main constitutive forces in a society, and what aspects or conceptions of it are sociological? It is not at all a simple



problem. A society and its members present successively the aspects of aggregation, cohesion, sunderance, sympathy, antipathy, egoism, indifference, constructiveness, destructiveness, public spirit, self-seeking, conservatism, radicalism, and a long series of forms and phases of industrial production, arts, science, politics, culture, and so forth. The most general fact is simple gregariousness, the statement of which is almost a truism; the primary gregariousness is compatible with all degrees of self-seeking; and every ideal of social well-being is in terms of an individual proclivity. In face of the vast complex, one can in a general way sympathise with Dr. Simmel's need for a dispassionate description of all the reactions. But his undertaking "to give to the fluctuating conception of sociology a content governed by *one* methodically sure problem-concept," however justifiable and however valid, will certainly not fix the conception of sociology. Sociologists may be influenced by his thoughts or his method; but they will infallibly revert to other ways of thinking of society. No more than the method of Spencer, which sees in the anatomy of early social forms the abstract of all social evolution, can the method of analysis of social relations in the abstract satisfy the general and eternal craving to understand the "how," the sequence, of social experience. Among the "ways of regarding the phenomena" which are rightly to be termed sociological must be included any way which studies social causation and works in terms thereof. And Dr. Simmel's way might better entitle itself "socio-psychology" than a science of the social process as such.

J. M. ROBERTSON.

#### LABOUR AND THE STATE.

"IL SOCIALISMO GUIRIDICO." By Professor Francesco Cosentini. Catania: Cav. Niccolò Giannotta, 1910.

"LA SOCIOCRAITIE: ESSAI DE POLITIQUE POSITIVE." By Eugène Fournière. Paris: V. Giard et E. Brière, 1910.

AMONG the social phenomena common to all the nations of our Western world, none is more general than the constantly increasing volume of labour legislation. It hardly began before the last century; for the earlier interferences of the modern state in industry were mostly fiscal in their origin, and only incidentally resulted in the protection of the labourer or the organisation of labour. The present movement which bulks so largely in the statute book of every European nation has gone on in spite of the doubts of many of the leading economists. These doubts Professor Cosentini does not share. His book contains a succinct account of the victorious progress of labour legislation in every civilised country, which although it is not quite brought down to the present moment, is of great utility in enabling the reader to compare the labour laws in various places. It is at once a demonstration of the universal tendency, and a monument of his own research. It must, however, be said that the author has introduced one source of confusion, which he might well have avoided. He includes among labour laws, changes in the legal position of women, though these obviously affect all classes of women and perhaps none more than holders of property. Nor do the two necessarily go together. According to Professor Cosentini's own view woman has the greatest freedom under Russian law (p. 81), and in that country alone is the right of combination denied to workmen (p. 108).

Professor Cosentini is optimistic throughout. The Social Revolution is to be replaced by labour legislation under which the socialised State will be peacefully reached. The old revolutionary formulæ, the Rights of Man, the Class War, etc., are to be retained with a relative instead of an absolute meaning. Individualism and socialism are to be combined in a happy union. M. Fournière looks deeper. Accepting the tendency to state interference in industry, and believing it to be permanent, he asks whether the modern democratic state, as it is at present constituted, can properly fulfil the new functions that are being imposed on it, whether a reformed machinery is not necessary to support the new burdens. It may be noted that although in this country the words "Sociocracy" and "Positive Polity" are usually connected with the writings of Auguste Comte, this is no longer so in France, where they have passed with the fundamentals of the Positive Philosophy into current usage. M. Fournière only refers once to Comte and that quite incidentally. By Sociocracy he means government organised for social ends, by *Positive Polity* a polity based on science and reality and not on metaphysical theories.

M. Cosentini and M. Fournière thus agree in foreseeing the socialisation of industry; they both consider that socialism has been a valuable instrument to that end; and they alike repudiate revolution. In addition, they reject the Materialist Theory of History, and they display an excellent brevity. But beyond this, they are completely at variance both in methods and conclusions. The Italian accepts democracy as a matter of course; he attempts no analysis of its working; though he submits the theories of a whole host of professors to analysis, his main end is to collect relevant facts. The Frenchman has also, there is no doubt, observed widely, but the result only appears incidentally in the keen discrimination with which he probes the current democratic and socialistic theories. The latter, supported by a mystical belief in a scarcely possible future, would in his view need a miracle to be brought into practice; and, even were it accomplished, the people would soon be glad to recall the bourgeoisie to the administration of the state and of capital. He has no difficult task in showing the incompetence of a state for industrial administration, when its institutions have come into existence either to keep order or to hold authority in check. Democratic ignorance, the expectation that everyone can be competent to decide everything, is exposed with keen humour. If the State is to fulfil what M. Fournière believes to be its manifest destiny, if it is not merely to keep an eye on the private employers of labour and regulate their dealings with the workers—which he considers only a transitional stage—but is ultimately to become more and more an administrator of industry, then the State itself must be transformed.

But even the author of an "*Essai de Politique positive*" finds that it is easier to criticise than to construct, and it is possible that a follower of Karl Marx might find many opportunities of avenging his master, by an analysis of the substantive proposals of Marx's critic. M. Fournière finds in free associations, such as trade unions and other professional syndicates, organs of a real sociocracy. To the unions he would entrust, under the supervision of the State, the management of railways and other industrial undertakings as they pass from the hands of private capitalists. To educational associations would be entrusted the education of the people, and so for the other departments recently added to the domain of public administration. The State would guarantee the popular character of these associations, and it would find in them a better means of choosing repre-

representative bodies. Instead of geographical constituencies, socially amorphous, the right of electing deputies would be enjoyed by the various associations. It would, in the author's opinion, be no disadvantage that citizens whose public spirit led them to enrol themselves in more than one association, would have more than one vote. By thus entrusting public functions to bodies at once public and voluntary, M. Fournière believes that he has succeeded in combining all that is best in socialism and in individualism, and has shown the way to avoid the tyranny of the plutocrat and the tyranny of the Socialist State.

S. H. SWINNY.

---

"THROUGH AFRO-AMERICA." By William Archer. Chapman & Hall, 10/6.

MR. ARCHER has written a book describing his travels through the Southern United States. As a journalist he touches lightly and descriptively upon many subjects, but the main object of his inquiry, the theme running through the otherwise somewhat disjointed chapters, is the problem of the negro. By his insistent reference of every topic to its bearing on the colour question he gives, no doubt intentionally, a vivid impression of the way in which this element runs through all American life.

When two races live together so utterly unlike, physically and mentally, every social institution, incapable of adequately serving both, has either to be duplicated or forced into an irritating and unsatisfactory compromise. The tendency in America appears to be more and more towards duplication. Religion, education, social intercourse and marriage, are now served by institutions separate for the members of each race. But this solution cannot be indefinitely extended. Mr. Archer, it is true, does not treat the problems so generally. He finds in the South, and in himself also, certain root prejudices and instincts which render it impossible for races so dissimilar to live together closely and in comfort. No Southerner would deny that he has fully entered into the attitude of mind which has brought about the "Jim Crow" car and the other devices for maintaining distinction of colour. The author not only makes an avowal of these instincts, but would evidently also be prepared to go some way in justifying them on the ground of racial superiority and integrity. "I have not hitherto emphasised the essential and innate inferiority of the negro race, because my argument did not demand it. But the fact of this inferiority seems to me as evident as it is inevitable." And again: "the boundary between European and African is real, and not to be argued away. The European is the fruit of untold generations of upward struggle, the African of untold generations of immobility."

The black race is radically different in many important respects from the white and, without presumption, it is argued, we may on historical and ethical grounds regard these differences not only as constituting an inferiority in the black race but as causing an insuperable feeling of repugnance in the white which would not, even if it were desirable, be overcome by any mere effort of will. This, shortly, is the attitude of the South and one with which Mr. Archer evidently has much sympathy. But the force of the argument is more apparent than real. Mr. Archer himself draws attention to the irreconcilable incongruity between the 'Jim Crow' car and both democracy and Christianity. Logically, therefore, the Southern attitude can only be justified on the assumption that the prin-

ciples of Christianity and democracy are either invalid or not of universal application. A frank recognition of this would certainly be unacceptable to the majority of the South, but might render much of the discussion on the subject more fruitful than it often is at present. There still remains the plea of the inevitable, the argument that "human nature being what it is," etc.—a familiar and dangerous weapon. Here again, however, Mr. Archer admits that in other parts of the world the white and the negro live together amicably enough. But, he says, the circumstances in such cases are different. In West Africa and in the West Indies the white population naturally and easily forms an alien aristocracy. In Spanish America there has been so free an intermixture of races that it would be impossible to draw any hard and fast colour line. But in the Southern States the whites are invited to share their own homeland with a race of nearly equal numbers on terms which would mean a surrender of their political, social, and economic predominance. It cannot be denied that in America the problem presents difficulties which are not met with elsewhere. And so Mr. Archer comes to consider the various solutions which are offered and his reasons for regarding them all as inadequate. He gives a sympathetic and living presentation of the "two leaders," Mr. Booker Washington and Mr. Du Bois. The aims of the former are centred mainly in the economic and of the latter in the spiritual development of the negro. Mr. Washington's views are summed up in his famous declaration: "In all things purely social we can be as separate as the five fingers, and yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress." Mr. Archer argues very forcibly that if the economic standard of the negro is to be raised to that of the white man, so that in the serious business of life the two can work together without friction and discord, the black race will never acquiesce in the social ostracism which is even now so bitterly resented. He is willing to grant the negro unlimited possibilities of educational, hygienic progress, but every such step in advance he is driven, in the light of the last twenty years' history, to regard as not easing but straining still further the social relations between black and white. With Mr. Du Bois' solution of raising the moral and intellectual standards of the negro Mr. Archer deals less fully. He cannot bring himself to regard these questions as really fundamental. "If the Ethiopian could but change his skin how trifling would be the problem raised by his ignorance, shiftlessness, poverty, and crime."

For one attitude Mr. Archer has scant respect. The facile humanitarianism which would deny the existence of any problem, apart from hysteria or nerves, which a little charity and kindly feelings would not solve, he dismisses as superficial dogmatism. His criticisms are put forward with great force, but the author himself seems to fall into the error of dogmatism when he comes to consider the possibility of interbreeding as an easing of the problem. He will not admit that the mulatto is markedly superior to the black, even, we suppose, according to white standards. In this he is by no means alone, but his own book offers a curious commentary, for of all the coloured persons whose opinions he regards as worthy of quotation, while nearly all are noted as having strains of white blood, not one is referred to as being pure black. Mr. Archer appears to assume that the mulatto would increase at the expense of the white population. If, as is more probable, it should grow at the expense of the black, his case against Sir Sydney Olivier falls to the ground. But before any definite policy with regard to legalising intermarriage could be

adopted there is urgent need of more statistical evidence upon the characteristics of the mulatto. There exists very little, if any, at the present time, but it should not be impossible to discover by statistical methods in what proportion the more salient characteristics of the two races tend to develop in offspring of mixed descent.

And what of Mr. Archer's proposal to establish a negro State within the Union? The policy is advocated with much skill but objections to it seem insuperable. The author hardly seems to face the economic difficulty of finding for ten million negroes, not the most enterprising or thrifty of colonists, means of subsistence in what would presumably be one of the least naturally productive states of the Union. Upon the details of such a scheme he naturally refuses to enter. They must be left to the "great American statesman who is to come. If he can successfully grapple with this colossal task he will deserve to rank with Washington and Lincoln in the affections of his countrymen." But fifty years ago, when the problem was still fluid and economic ties less binding than they now are, it was Lincoln himself who devised a scheme of expatriation and failed in its accomplishment. Mr. Archer's scheme, it is true, would still leave the negroes citizens of the United States, but it is difficult to believe that this fact would greatly simplify the tremendous task of transportation, while it would still leave to the Federal Government the responsibility for the good government of a race necessarily alien and possibly hostile. Criticism, however, of any constructive policy is easy, and if the American people, with their limitless resources and unbounded energy could agree upon some policy of segregation it would be rash to deny beforehand all possibility of ultimate success. However this may be, Mr. Archer's book is an acute, finely written, and stimulating contribution to the study of the race problem in America. Its candour is most wholesome, even if not always palatable. Few subjects require such a resolute determination to face facts as they really are and not as one might wish or presuppose them to be. At the same time it must be recognised that Mr. Archer's point of view is at bottom consistently that of the white man. He recognises an "obligation" towards the negro, but it is doubtful how far the black race will ever willingly agree to terms dictated by a somewhat grudging and merely mechanical intellectual benevolence.

E. T. SCOTT.

---

"FIGHTING THE SLAVE-HUNTERS IN CENTRAL AFRICA." By Alfred J. Swann.

With an introduction by Sir H. H. Johnston, G.C.M.G., K.C.B.  
Seeley & Co., 1910. 16s. net.

THIRTY years ago East Africa was much as Burton, Speke, Livingstone & the early travellers had known it; the Arab slave trade was being carried on with unabated vigour, and till this could be checked all natural development of the country was at a standstill. In 1882 the London Missionary Society decided to launch two mission boats on Lake Tanganyika and Mr. Swann was sent out to assist Captain Hose in this enterprise. It was a move of supreme importance in grappling with the slave-trade, for Ujiji on the east coast of the lake was the inland headquarters of the great Arab dealers Tip-pu-Tib and Rimaliza. From that base they were able to tap the resources of Central Africa about the Upper Congo, transporting vast numbers of slaves and quantities of ivory across the lake in dhows to Ujiji, and thence marching them down to the coast, each slave carrying a load of ivory. Arrived at Ujiji after his difficult march of 825 miles from



the coast, the author soon had to cross swords in diplomacy with the two leading slave traders. They had in the past been proud to render every assistance to white travellers, and, though fully aware of the motives of Mr. Swann's line of action, they nevertheless treated him with great consideration. "Let me at once," he says, "place on record my sincere appreciation of the kindness shown to me for many years by both these powerful men, for on one or two occasions they saved my life from the plots of their co-religionists during a period of great disturbance." Years afterwards Tip-pu-Tib, seeing that the storm which he had long apprehended was about to burst, withdrew from the scene of conflict to Zanzibar. His partner Rumliza ("One who utterly finishes") refused to follow his example, and eventually fought with the Belgians for the Upper Congo.

The wisdom of interference by Europeans in relations between native races has been frequently called in question: in this particular case it was abundantly justified, for here the slave trade was no oppression of one black people by another but the deliberate exploitation of blacks by Arabs, and it was essential for a higher power to intervene to prevent the sapping of Africa's strength. The persistence of conquered peoples as servile groups under their conquerors is an utterly different condition of things from the incursions of an alien people of higher civilisation like the Arabs.

The dream of certain diplomatists in those days was to secure a chain of British possessions from the Cape to Cairo, Tanganyika being of course free to the vessels of all nations. At the request of Consul—now Sir Harry—Johnston, Mr. Swann set out to make treaties with native chiefs which should secure the one link missing between the north end of Tanganyika and the headquarters of the Nile. The account of these efforts affords an object lesson in empire-building; they were however nullified by a different partition of that part of Africa by which the area thus obtained for Great Britain fell to Germany and the Congo State.

The last part of the book deals with the author's work as a Government official in Nyasaland where he helped to quell semi-Arab opposition and settle the country. In his view agriculture is the mainstay of African prosperity, rice, cotton and tobacco being most successfully cultivated; but "if Nyasaland is ever to become a valuable asset to the Empire, the railway ought at once to be constructed; otherwise . . . there seems no alternative but to turn the whole population into labourers for the northern and southern mines. . . . I hope the casting vote will be given to the building up of a solid foundation on agriculture."

Mr. Swann's book should appeal to a large public. It is a delightfully vigorous and simple tale of the work that is going on in a remote part of the world for the consolidation and extension of our Empire, and Mr. Swann is precisely the type of man to whom such work should be entrusted. The reader cannot fail to be impressed by his quick powers of observation, his tact and readiness in dealing with natives and his wonderful mastery of the symbolism and innuendo by means of which they express themselves. There are thrilling descriptions of big game hunting, fights with natives, and squalls encountered on the lakes, and some delightful sketches of native character. The geological formation and marine fauna of Lake Tanganyika are briefly dealt with; the ethnologist will find accounts of the initiation of girls and marriage customs among the Walnugu of South Tanganyika, of children's games on land and in water about Nyasa, and of religious and other beliefs. The book contains 45 excellent illustrations and a map of the area dealt with.

A. C. HADDON.

"CHINA AND RELIGION." By E. H. Parker, Professor of Chinese at the Victoria University, Manchester. London: John Murray. 2/6 (popular edition).

SINOLOGISTS are few and far between. Hence the learned author must not take it amiss if his book has fallen into the hands of one unversed in things Chinese, yet none the less deeply interested in the sociological aspect of what is here recorded. This work is evidently based upon a most careful study of authorities, and covers a vast amount of ground. It deals in turn with the great religions, whether of native or foreign origin, which China in its long history has had an opportunity of assimilating or rejecting. We learn that, contrary to the common belief, this great country has always stood for the principle of religious toleration. Thus the rival religions have each, in a sense, been given their chance. As befits, however, a civilisation remarkably self-centred and self-sufficient, a home-born religion, or rather philosophy, has held its own with the educated class. The lower orders, on the other hand, show themselves more amenable to alien influences, and the vague faith of the primitive Chinese—a subject on which Professor Parker, who does not attempt to supplement literary tradition by means of the latest anthropological research, is perhaps not very illuminating—has largely given way before a certain form of Buddhism. This is not the place in which to discuss the comparative failure of Christianity to effect a lodgement. Neither in 638 when the Nestorians were formally admitted by the Emperor as "Persian bonzes," nor more recently when Roman Catholics and Protestants have carried competition to the point of scandal, the Orthodox Church meanwhile contrasting favourably by its moderation, can Christian ideas be said to have taken firm hold of the Chinese nation, or any section of it. To the sociologist the most impressive fact of all must be the political stability achieved, so far as a philosophic or religious theory of life has had to do with the matter, under the influence of the body of doctrine known as the Tao, or 'Way' (of which Confucianism is but, as it were, the more courtly version). When Plato dreamt that "guardians" could be so educated as to carry on a type of perfect state that should change not at all, he lacked but the Tao, it would seem, in order that his phantasy should be realized. The translation of the Taoist classic, the Tao-têh King, which is given in an appendix, is from this point of view especially instructive. It bids the sage "aim at extreme disinterestedness and maintain the utmost possible calm." "It is by bending that we survive, by giving way that we assert. It is by lowliness that we exercise full force, by wear and tear that we go on renewing. It is by owning little that we possess much; by owning much that bewilderment comes. For which reasons the highest form of man is single in purpose as an example to the rest of the world. He shines because he does not show himself off; is convincing because he does not justify himself; successful because he does not proclaim success; enduring because he does not assert himself." Such is Têh, "virtue" or "grace"—that "highest grace which makes no pose of grace." Possess it, and "the Empire is possessed of the principle of Providence." "One may discern the Providence of Heaven without ever looking out of the window." "If you approach the Empire armed with Providence, the devils will no longer possess spiritual powers." Sociologists, with all their respect for anthropo-geography and the like, have to remember that ideas are amongst the most effective of social conditions. And it is at least worth while to ask whether the much

abused Chinese official class does not on the whole live up to a higher moral ideal of the conscious and reflective kind than any similar class to be met with in the West, though the question can fully be answered only by those who are expert sociologists and expert Sinologists into the bargain.

R. R. MARETT.

**"EARLY CHRISTIAN ETHICS IN THE WEST. FROM CLEMENT TO AMBROSE."**

By H. H. Scullard, M.A. (Lond. and Cambs.), D.D. (Lond.), Professor of Church History, Christian Ethics, and History of Religions in New and Hackney Colleges, London. London: Williams and Norgate, 1907.

THIS is a painstaking and useful piece of historical work, evidencing much serious study of the early Western Fathers, ending with St. Ambrose, and of the modern literature of the period and subject. The task is conscientiously performed: the author does justice to both the stronger side of the writers whom he criticises and to their weaker side, that side in which he sympathises with them and the side in which he does not: and his criticisms are reasonable and discriminating.

The feature of the book which seems most open to criticism is a tendency at every turn to disparage the non-Christian Moralists at the expense of the Christian. I do not doubt that on the whole the morality of the Christian teachers is superior to that of their non-Christian contemporaries, nor should I be in the least disposed to quarrel with him for insisting upon the advantage which, both from a theoretical point of view and from that of practical effectiveness, the Christian teaching derives from its intimate connexion in which it stands to Christian theology. But the writer is always hinting at fundamental differences between the Christian and the non-Christian point of view without making any serious attempt to explain wherein precisely their difference consists. When the attempt is made at all the result is not very satisfying: "The self-sufficiency of the natural heart of man is never fully overcome in heathenism. Neither the Stoic nor Pythagorean, nor, we may add, the Platonic theories will enable a man to surrender himself to a higher power, and, freed from the guilt of the past, to become a new creature. Repentance is not possible. Guilt is ignorance. Sin is a disease. Punishment is not penal. Death is not due to sin, but a law of nature. And with the absence of a true sense of sin and of the necessity of repentance, the philosophers part company with the Christians" (p. 111).

We may fully admit the much deeper sense of sin, of the necessity for repentance, and the like which Christianity has brought with it. We may admit that the writer correctly points out the weak side of pagan Ethics. But surely the above is a very one-sided account of the teaching of the best pagans. Even Aristotle—least spiritual of the great pagan writers—explicitly rejected the doctrine that "guilt is ignorance." Is there *no* sense of sin in Seneca's words: "If we would be upright judges of all things, let us first persuade ourselves of this, that not one of us is without fault (De Ira., II, 27)." Was there *no* repentance implied in the same philosopher's habit of daily self examination? And in what sense does Dr. Scullard hold that "death is due to sin?" Does he really maintain, as the Latin Fathers would of course have done, that but for Adam's fall man would be physically immortal? Then again we are told that the "new (*i.e.*, Christian) idea of the virtuous life is [by Hermas] traced to its

proper source, and based upon the facts of the Christian redemption" (p. 242). Does Dr. Scullard mean that no true conception of a virtuous life is taught by Jesus Christ Himself in the Sermon of the Mount, because He certainly makes no attempt to "base" his conception of it upon either the "fact" of His own death upon the Cross, or upon the theory about the atoning efficacy of that death?

Even those who are in sympathy with Dr. Scullard's theology will hardly feel that he does much to help them to a philosophical appreciation of the differences between Christian and Pagan Ethics, or of the connexion between Christian Ethics and Christian Theology: but to those who simply want to find out what the early Western Fathers actually thought on ethical subjects the book can be safely recommended. It is interesting reading, though it is impossible to turn over these pages without feeling a little regret that the writer's programme did not include the Eastern Fathers as well as the Western. When we read Clement of Alexandria or Origen we feel that we are conversing with the intellectual countrymen of Socrates and Plato, with men who have added to the intellectual inheritance of the Greeks something of priceless value which came from Judæa. We have no such feeling in reading a half-civilised barbarian like Tertullian. Even Tertullian had, no doubt, learned something, and something very important which was hid from Socrates and Plato and M. Aurelius, but we feel also that he has forgotten much which they did know: and if anyone were to add that there is more of the spirit of Christ in the three last mentioned writers than in Tertullian, he would have much to say for himself.

H. RASHDALL.

---

THE LIFE OF W. J. FOX, PUBLIC TEACHER AND SOCIAL REFORMER (1786—1864). By the late Dr. Richard Garnett, concluded by Edward Garnett. John Lane, 16/-.

WILLIAM JOHNSON FOX having waited long for a biographer found one of exceptional qualifications in Dr. Richard Garnett, who unfortunately did not live to complete what was unquestionably a piece of very congenial work. The fame of the orator and the journalist is proverbially brief. Fox was essentially an orator and journalist, and as a consequence it is only to the minority that he is known as one of the most powerful personal forces of his time. There is nothing especially fascinating about his personality, but, thanks to Dr. Garnett, he has now been given his rightful position in the history of the Reform era—a position similar to, yet strikingly contrasted with, that held by Francis Place.

Fox's mental history ran on lines more or less parallel with that of many another child of the later eighteenth century. Beginning life as a Norwich weaver boy, his ambitions turned to the ministry and he went through a course of training at a Nonconformist seminary, breaking the bonds of orthodoxy in very early manhood. South Place Chapel was built for him in 1824 and it remained the principal theatre of his activity until the campaign against the Corn Laws provided him with a vastly extended sphere. It was, indeed, not until 1852, when he had already been in Parliament for several years, that he finally severed his connection with the pulpit which he had made memorable in the history of liberal religion. His energy was prodigious, and he managed to combine the work of the preacher with incessant journalistic activity, and an activity no less incessant in the sphere of political and social agitation.

abused Chinese official class does not on the whole live up to a higher moral ideal of the conscious and reflective kind than any similar class to be met with in the West, though the question can fully be answered only by those who are expert sociologists and expert Sinologists into the bargain.

R. R. MARETT.

**"EARLY CHRISTIAN ETHICS IN THE WEST. FROM CLEMENT TO AMBROSE."**

By H. H. Scullard, M.A. (Lond. and Camb.), D.D. (Lond.), Professor of Church History, Christian Ethics, and History of Religions in New and Hackney Colleges, London. London: Williams and Norgate, 1907.

THIS is a painstaking and useful piece of historical work, evidencing much serious study of the early Western Fathers, ending with St. Ambrose, and of the modern literature of the period and subject. The task is conscientiously performed: the author does justice to both the stronger side of the writers whom he criticises and to their weaker side, that side in which he sympathises with them and the side in which he does not: and his criticisms are reasonable and discriminating.

The feature of the book which seems most open to criticism is a tendency at every turn to disparage the non-Christian Moralists at the expense of the Christian. I do not doubt that on the whole the morality of the Christian teachers is superior to that of their non-Christian contemporaries, nor should I be in the least disposed to quarrel with him for insisting upon the advantage which, both from a theoretical point of view and from that of practical effectiveness, the Christian teaching derives from its intimate connexion in which it stands to Christian theology. But the writer is always hinting at fundamental differences between the Christian and the non-Christian point of view without making any serious attempt to explain wherein precisely their difference consists. When the attempt is made at all the result is not very satisfying: "The self-sufficiency of the natural heart of man is never fully overcome in heathenism. Neither the Stoic nor Pythagorean, nor, we may add, the Platonic theories will enable a man to surrender himself to a higher power, and, freed from the guilt of the past, to become a new creature. Repentance is not possible. Guilt is ignorance. Sin is a disease. Punishment is not penal. Death is not due to sin, but a law of nature. And with the absence of a true sense of sin and of the necessity of repentance, the philosophers part company with the Christians" (p. 111).

We may fully admit the much deeper sense of sin, of the necessity for repentance, and the like which Christianity has brought with it. We may admit that the writer correctly points out the weak side of pagan Ethics. But surely the above is a very one-sided account of the teaching of the best pagans. Even Aristotle—least spiritual of the great pagan writers—explicitly rejected the doctrine that "guilt is ignorance." Is there *no* sense of sin in Seneca's words: "If we would be upright judges of all things, let us first persuade ourselves of this, that not one of us is without fault (*De Ira.*, II, 27)." Was there *no* repentance implied in the same philosopher's habit of daily self examination? And in what sense does Dr. Scullard hold that "death is due to sin"? Does he really maintain, as the Latin Fathers would of course have done, that but for Adam's fall man would be physically immortal? Then again we are told that the "new (*i.e.*, Christian) idea of the virtuous life is [by *Hermas*] traced to its



proper source, and based upon the facts of the Christian redemption" (p. 242). Does Dr. Scullard mean that no true conception of a virtuous life is taught by Jesus Christ Himself in the Sermon of the Mount, because He certainly makes no attempt to "base" his conception of it upon either the "fact" of His own death upon the Cross, or upon the theory about the atoning efficacy of that death?

Even those who are in sympathy with Dr. Scullard's theology will hardly feel that he does much to help them to a philosophical appreciation of the differences between Christian and Pagan Ethics, or of the connexion between Christian Ethics and Christian Theology: but to those who simply want to find out what the early Western Fathers actually thought on ethical subjects the book can be safely recommended. It is interesting reading, though it is impossible to turn over these pages without feeling a little regret that the writer's programme did not include the Eastern Fathers as well as the Western. When we read Clement of Alexandria or Origen we feel that we are conversing with the intellectual countrymen of Socrates and Plato, with men who have added to the intellectual inheritance of the Greeks something of priceless value which came from Judæa. We have no such feeling in reading a half-civilised barbarian like Tertullian. Even Tertullian had, no doubt, learned something, and something very important which was hid from Socrates and Plato and M. Aurelius, but we feel also that he has forgotten much which they did know: and if anyone were to add that there is more of the spirit of Christ in the three last mentioned writers than in Tertullian, he would have much to say for himself.

H. RASHDALL.

---

THE LIFE OF W. J. FOX, PUBLIC TEACHER AND SOCIAL REFORMER (1786—1864). By the late Dr. Richard Garnett, concluded by Edward Garnett. John Lane, 16/-.

WILLIAM JOHNSON FOX having waited long for a biographer found one of exceptional qualifications in Dr. Richard Garnett, who unfortunately did not live to complete what was unquestionably a piece of very congenial work. The fame of the orator and the journalist is proverbially brief. Fox was essentially an orator and journalist, and as a consequence it is only to the minority that he is known as one of the most powerful personal forces of his time. There is nothing especially fascinating about his personality, but, thanks to Dr. Garnett, he has now been given his rightful position in the history of the Reform era—a position similar to, yet strikingly contrasted with, that held by Francis Place.

Fox's mental history ran on lines more or less parallel with that of many another child of the later eighteenth century. Beginning life as a Norwich weaver boy, his ambitions turned to the ministry and he went through a course of training at a Nonconformist seminary, breaking the bonds of orthodoxy in very early manhood. South Place Chapel was built for him in 1824 and it remained the principal theatre of his activity until the campaign against the Corn Laws provided him with a vastly extended sphere. It was, indeed, not until 1852, when he had already been in Parliament for several years, that he finally severed his connection with the pulpit which he had made memorable in the history of liberal religion. His energy was prodigious, and he managed to combine the work of the preacher with incessant journalistic activity, and an activity no less incessant in the sphere of political and social agitation.

For readers of this Review, however, perhaps the most interesting thing about him is the fact that he stands out from among his contemporaries as a politician inspired by some glimmerings of a broader social conception. There are many passages in his addresses and letters, especially during the forties, which show that he might, in other circumstances, have worked out for the reformers of his day a programme more satisfying than that with which the Manchester School was contented. His biographer puts it thus:

In Fox indeed met and harmonised in an unusual degree all the liberal emancipating movements of his generation. He was a free-thinker in the widest sense of the word, a religious teacher of morals, an educationalist, a Radical propagandist, a literary journalist, a corn-law reformer, and a man of the people at heart. And because he was all these things, because he gathered up and reflected back to a popular audience all the floating social Liberalism of his time, because he did not concentrate his energies and specialize in one branch, he is now almost forgotten.

This book we may suppose will do something to restore his reputation. It will not take rank among the masterpieces of political biography: neither the subject nor the material is sufficient for that. But it will count as an informing addition to the records of a period which was extraordinarily productive of vigorous movements and masterful individuals. The proofs, as with so many other recent books of the same class, have been very badly read. S. K. R.

---

“LE CULTE DE L'INCOMPÉTENCE.” Par Emile Faguet. Paris: Bernard Grasset.

MONTESQUIEU has discovered the principles which underlie various forms of government. He tells us that the principle of monarchy is honour, that of despotism fear, and that of a republic virtue. Monsieur Faguet now adds to the list by the discovery that the principle of democracy is the worship of inefficiency, and the bulk of his book is devoted to the proof of this proposition. There are, we are told, forms of government commonly but improperly called democratic, which may have a certain degree of efficiency. There is the form in which direct choice of legislators by the people is avoided, in which the people choose electors and these electors choose the legislators. There is also the form which is nominally direct election by the people, but in which aristocrats by their guile and address get themselves elected in place of more real representatives of the people. Such governments are in the opinion of our author really disguised aristocracies and not democracies at all.

In a true democracy, according to Monsieur Faguet, the people fear to elect a man superior to themselves in social position, wealth, ability, education, eloquence or address, lest he should use the power thus entrusted to him for his own benefit or for the benefit of his class and not for the benefit of his constituents. Consequently the legislator elected by a true democracy is simply the average of his constituents. “Alongside of this I think of the arrangement of a commercial house, in which everyone does what he has learned to do and what he does best, the workman, the cashier, the superintendent. Only in the supreme matter of legislation, which above all requires the expert, do we find the man with no special training, the hopelessly incompetent average of his constituents.”

Next an attempted remedy is discussed, the remedy of universal education. It is argued at length that the schoolmaster, originating from the people, retains all their suspicion of the aristocrat, and instead of leading his pupils to better views confirms them in the bad old way of electing as legislators average incompetent samples of themselves. How a schoolmaster would be flattered at this idea of his lifelong influence on the political views of his pupils! In the last chapter Monsieur Faguet relates his "dream" of what might be in a happier clime. There the people have complete faith in the aristocrat and gladly choose him for legislator. The aristocrat in turn is entirely unselfish and with his whole soul struggles to make laws for the benefit of the people.

The book will confirm any Englishman who reads it in his insular preference for the English meaning of democracy. He will reflect that an English constituency generally elects to Parliament a man markedly superior to the average voter, that the elected member frequently takes his duties seriously and works so hard at them as to become a real expert in his business, and that this expert knowledge is often applied in the interests of his constituency. So that the United Kingdom is possibly not so very far from the happier clime of our author's dream.

D. B. M.

---

"THE NEW SOCIALISM: AN IMPARTIAL INQUIRY." By Jane T. Stoddart.  
Hodder and Stoughton, 5/- net.

"ADVENTURES IN SOCIALISM: NEW LANARK ESTABLISHMENT AND ORBISTON COMMUNITY." By Alex. Cullen. A. & C. Black, 7/6 net.

MISS STODDART'S book should perhaps have been called an impartial summary, rather than inquiry. It is the work of a capable journalist who has read diligently in the literature of Socialism and has made a careful collection of passages from the writings of leading Socialists—chiefly French, German, and Italian—on the more important questions embraced by Socialist theory and policy. There is, however, little or nothing of inquiry in the philosophical sense of the word; the author makes no attempt to analyse the almost numberless statements of opinion quoted or to build up from them a body of general Socialist doctrine. The book is concerned in the main with the Socialist movement of the past decade, and therein lies its principal merit, for, as Miss Stoddart rightly says, the larger historical books do not bring the subject down to recent years. Some of the chapters—such as those on the rewards of labour, the family, foreign policy, and Socialism and religion—are decidedly incomplete. On the whole, perhaps, the book will be useful to the average student mainly because of its brief account of Revolutionary Syndicalism and the teaching of such leaders as Georges Sorel.

The story of Robert Owen's career is so familiar and has been told so thoroughly by his later biographers that there seems no sufficient justification for the first part of Mr. Cullen's book. There is nothing fresh to be known about New Lanark, or if there is Mr. Cullen has not discovered it. But he has an interesting subject in the Orbiston community, the full record of which has not been published. Orbiston, an offshoot of New Lanark, was a communist experiment made on the banks of the Calder near Motherwell. Its founders and directors—A. J. Hamilton and Abram Combe—drew their inspiration from Owen, although at the time of their enterprise there were rather serious differences between the master and his

disciples. The design of the community took shape in 1825; it lasted about four years. The story forms an instructive chapter in the somewhat pathetic annals of communist experiment.

S. K. R.

---

"CHARITY AND SOCIAL LIFE." By C. S. Loch, B.A., Hon.LL.D. (St. Andrews), Hon.D.C.L. (Oxford). Macmillan & Co., 6/- net.

AS stated in the preface, this book is mainly a reprint of an article on "Charity and the Charities" which was first published in 1902 in the supplementary volumes of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Mr. Loch has now added chapters on charity in relation to the growth of religious thought, and also on some of the questions raised by the recent Royal Commission on Poor Laws and Relief of Distress. The historical survey of the development of the social attitude towards the poor is interesting and valuable, and will be of use in this more portable form, but we cannot regard Mr. Loch's own conclusions as at all inevitable. The permanence of the mediæval structure of society, as regards its classes of rich and poor, seems implicitly assumed, and we might gather that the great risk is that the rich may from thoughtless generosity further degrade the necessitous. Though the author rightly regards charity as a social virtue, his fear lest its exercise should undermine "character" hardly expresses a very profound appreciation of its possibilities. Strength of character, after all, is not an attribute to be bred individually by fostering care; it is a healthy instinctive response to normal and encouraging conditions, and the state that desires this quality in its citizens will see that these conditions are their birthright, and not matters to be withheld or granted at the will of a specially favoured few. Charity should be so integrally identified with the social structure that it should no more need special societies or precaution in its exercise than—say, heroism. So far as the inevitable needs of our industrial organization are concerned, the proper place for charity is, we think, not the subscription list, but the wages sheet and the taxpayer.

M. B. M.

---

"NEIGHBOURS AND FRIENDS." By M. Loane. Edward Arnold, 6/-.

THE theorist and the social worker, the journalist, the teacher, and the member of any kind of public body may all be advised to read Miss Loane's entertaining book—not for her opinions but for the record of her personal experiences among the poor. It is a document which might well have a place beside the Reports of the Poor Law Commission and all the other social surveys of the time. Light and unsystematic as her chapters are, they represent the human side of the poverty problem, and in these days of ever extending institutionalism their significance can on no account be underestimated. Whether treating of poor relief or old-age pensions, nursing or school, Miss Loane is illustrating the real life and the philosophy of the working classes—about which our reformers and legislators often enough know nothing. The book is full of illuminating things.

---

"BROAD LINES IN SCIENCE TEACHING." Edited by F. Hodson, with an Introduction by M. E. Sadler. Christophers, 5/- net.

THIS collection of papers is of value not only from the *pædagogic* point of view but as emphasizing the civic and pragmatic tendency of modern education. Professor Sadler, in an introduction which passes in review

the main ideas of the various contributors to the volume, reminds us that the study of natural science has been the second great impulse of innovation in the schools and like the classical renaissance represents "indignation at obsolete restraints upon the mind," while Mr. J. H. Badley points out the nature of the present compromise between classical teaching and the modern side. While all the chapters contain useful material, we may note especially Mr. Oswald Latter's excellent paper on biology in schools, Dr. Percy Nunn's suggestive treatment of the place of hypothesis in science teaching, Mr. Sidney Unwin's handling of a difficult theme, "Science teaching and the training of affections," and the discussion of the child's philosophy by Miss Cora B. Sanders. In all alike the school of the future is foreshadowed in its right relation, as the complement of the home in the work of preparing the child for the functions of manhood and womanhood, of citizenship and humanity. By the way, it seems the cruellest of ironies that, while the modern teacher's personality is made more and more important, Professor Sadler should have to complain of the low salaries and poor prospects of assistant teachers.



## PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS. Vol. xxiv, No. 3. Mr. C. R. Fay's article on "Small Holdings and Agricultural Co-operation in England" deals with some aspects of the question lately treated, from other points of view, by Sir Horace Plunkett and Dr. Hermann Levy before the Sociological Society. It refers to the influence of America on English agriculture, to the application of the Small Holdings Act of 1908 in Cambridgeshire, and the varying success of agricultural co-operation in England and on the Continent.—In "The Separation of State and Local Revenues" Mr. C. J. Bullock discusses a subject that has recently become matter of somewhat urgent practical importance.—A subject of no less topical interest is treated by Mr. F. Y. Edgeworth in "The Subjective Element in the First Principles of Taxation."—Other articles are: A. M. Sakolski—"Control of Railway Accounts in leading European Countries"; J. G. Thompson—"Present Work and Present Wages."

---

POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY. Vol. xxv, No. 1.—Under the title "The Attitude of Private Conscience toward Corporate Right" Mr. J. B. Ross considers some of the pressing questions created by the sure and rapid assumption by industry of a corporate form and its departure from the old-time individual direction. It seems, he observes, rather anomalous and difficult of comprehension that a form of industrial organisation which universally commends itself to the business world should yet be visited with marked popular opprobrium, and he contrasts this development with the unprecedented development of philanthropy and social service. "Private conscience is absolutely regardless of corporate right . . . . In every contingency in which the rights of the corporation impinge upon the rights or immunities of individuals, the latter assert the prerogatives of the human personality and deny justice to the corporation." "The causes of the misapprehension and of the deep-seated antagonism between American laymen and the private corporation, its directors and its stockholders, lie in the enigmatical personality of the corporation—a personality certainly existing, but not yet arrived at a maturity of its powers nor aware of its profound social obligations."—George Paish: "The British Budget and Social Reform." The remaining articles deal with American topics.

Vol. xxv, No. 2. Edward Porritt: "The British Labour Party in 1910."—H. W. Horwill: "Payment of Labour Representatives."—E. M. Sait: "Economic Aspects of the French Revolution."

---

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ETHICS. Vol. xx, No. 3.—Professor C. A. Ellwood, discussing the sociological basis of ethics, begins by observing that conduct, so far as it is thought out, must be based upon social knowledge, knowledge of the inter-relations of men. It is approximately correct to say that sociology is the biology and psychology of the social life. Sociology therefore must furnish the

immediate positive foundation for a science of ethics. It is conceivably possible that sociological investigation will in the near future clearly mark out the conditions of social survival, of social efficiency, and of social harmony; but it would be a mistake, in the writer's opinion, to consider that these determinations would of themselves constitute a science of ethics. The moral ideas which ethics seeks to set forth are not necessarily identical with the conditions of social survival, efficiency, and harmony.—Josiah Royce: "The Reality of the Temporal"; C. R. Henderson: "Ethical Problems of Prison Science"; F. C. Sharp and M. C. Otto: "The Popular Attitude towards Retributive Punishment."

---

ECONOMIC JOURNAL. No. 78.—Professor Shield Nicholson, in "The Economics of Imperialism" (his annual address to the Royal Economic Society), submits the question to examination in the light of his recent re-statement of Adam Smith's doctrine.—Mr. J. H. Clapham, in an article on the transference of the worsted industry from Norfolk to the West Riding, reviews the salient features of what is probably the classic case of industrial migration in English history.—I. G. Gibbon: "Compulsory Insurance against Unemployment"; Helen Bosanquet: "Historical Basis of English Poor-law Policy."

---

TOWN PLANNING REVIEW. Vol. i, No. 1.—We welcome with peculiar pleasure the advent of this Review, which is the journal of the department of Civic Design in the University of Liverpool and is edited by Mr. Patrick Abercrombie in collaboration with Mr. C. H. Reilly and Professor S. D. Adshead. The initial number contains a brief introduction to the study of civic design by Professor Adshead, a comprehensive account by the editor of the garden city and suburb schemes in England, a summary of town-planning schemes in America, a review of the Town-planning Act in its legal and administrative aspects, and a note by Mr. F. J. Marquis on the sociological side of town-planning. The Review has an attractive format and is fully illustrated. It should prove a valuable organ of education and propaganda in the rapidly growing movement of civic design.

---

THE EUGENICS REVIEW. Vol. ii, No. 1.—Dr. Schiller has some interesting remarks on National Selection, showing amongst other things that the community actually discourages the very qualities which it values most highly. Dr. Saleeby discusses alcohol as a racial poison, urging on behalf of the Eugenics Education Society that since alcoholism is in itself a symptom of degeneracy, a cause of further degeneracy, especially of blastophthoria (damaged germ-cell), of antenatal and post-natal alcoholic poisoning, not to dwell upon the later influence of an alcoholic home, parenthood should be protected from alcohol.—Colonel Melville seems to be guilty of some reservation in recommending military service from a eugenic point of view.—Mr. R. N. Crane shows how the marriage laws and certain prohibitive statutes in the United States affect the eugenic problem.

---

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY. Vol. xv, No. 5.—The contributions to this number (May) are largely concerned with the scope and purpose of Sociology and the position which it at present holds in the world of science. An interesting exception to this is the first article, Prof. W. G. Sumner's presidential address to the American Sociological Society, delivered last December, under the title of "Religion and the Mores." He begins with a statement of the relation of religion to society: "The religion has to follow the mores. In its nature no religion ever changes . . . A scientific or developing religion is an absurdity. But then again nothing is absolutely and externally true. Everything must change. Religion is no exception, therefore every religion is a resisting inertia which is being overcome by moving forces." It appears probable that all religious reformations have been due to changes in the mores—a statement that is illustrated by references to Israel and Islam as well as to Christianity, medieval and modern. Within fifty years in the United States the mores have very powerfully influenced religion. The dogmatic side has been abandoned by all the Protestant churches. The current fashion is social endeavour, and this sets the lines along which the churches move. Religion properly speaking, simply falls away. Humanitarianism has grown out of economic power. Its practical doctrines have been imposed upon modern religion by the mores. Then they have come from the religion to the modern world as religious ideas and duties, with religious and ecclesiastical sanctions. This is the usual interplay of the mores and religion.—Professor C. A. Ellwood discusses the psychological view of society, maintaining that the inter-relations between individuals which go to make up society are dominantly psychical, and that all explanations of human society must be largely a matter of the psychology of these relations. "The sociologist does not consider the individual as such, but only as a functioning element in the larger whole; while the psychologist on the contrary considers the social whole only to throw light on individual experience as such." Through the application of the psychological view of society we may develop, not only sound social theories, but also rules for guidance in social work.—Dr. Lester Ward, under the title of "Sociology and the State" cites the recent rapid spread of sociological study as evidence of progress in the science, though he notes the existence of "quite a large school of sociologists who, though claiming to be such, are virtually denying that Sociology is a science."—Mr. J. Q. Dealey expounds the main principles underlying the teaching of Sociology in Brown University, under Dr. Lester Ward's direction. Other articles: E. Dana Durand—"Changes in Census Methods"; W. F. Willcox—"The Outlook for American Statistics"; F. B. Sanborn—"History of the American Social Science Association"; A. W. Small—"The Sociological Stage in the Evolution of the Social Sciences."

Vol. xv, No. 6.—Professor Franklin H. Giddings, in an article on "The Social Marking System," considers how far the data of Sociology are capable of being tabulated with the aid of a marking-scale. After pointing out that rough scales of this kind have been adopted in regard to the phenomena of population, religion, ability, education, etc., he proceeds to outline a method by which the social marking scale may be used in the statistical analysis of sociological problems, giving illustrative diagrams.—The most elaborate paper in the number is Professor James H. Williams's "Outline of a Theory of Social Motives," an essay in social psychology which is confessedly the product of what the writer calls group study. It is impossible to summarize the paper, which is alike interesting and provocative. It ranges over subjects as diverse as the filial instinct and the poetic imagination, the idea of kinship and the productivity theory of wages.—J. T. Shotwell, discussing the place of Magic in primitive society, says that there does not exist an exhaustive description or analysis of magic, simply as magic, though it fills many treatises on other things. He makes the amusing statement that savages the world over have gone

farther in their analysis of their own actions than the author of "The Golden Bough."—In a paper on the "Influence of Superstition on the Evolution of Property Rights," Hutton Webster considers the bearing on property of the taboo.—Other articles: Professor Mark Baldwin—"The Basis of Social Solidarity"; G. A. Coe—"The Recent Census of Religious Bodies."

---

RIVISTA INTERNAZIONALE DI SCIENZE SOCIALI E DISCIPLINE AUSILIARIE. Vol. iii, Fasc. ccvii (March, 1910). Ettore Arduino: "La dottrina del Vico nella storia economica." Vico propounded a theory of development in a circle, the rise, maturity, and decay of civilisation being followed by its extinction and the rise of a new civilisation which would follow the same course—a course marked out by the nature and environment of mankind. For this circular development, the writer substitutes progress in a spiral—an idea which only arose a century later—and strangely enough treats this as the doctrine of Vico. He has no difficulty in showing that in secondary aspects at least, there is a recurrence to old tendencies—that for instance after the domination of the classical economists who left ethics out of economics, we are now returning to a view of industry wherein ethical considerations are taken into account as they were in the middle ages. Other instances may be found in the return to the state regulation of industry after a period of "laissez-faire" or the renewal of small industries in an age of electricity. It is curious to find that Comte, because he rejected theology, is classed with those who reject the ethical aspect of economics, whereas the recognition of that aspect is one of his most noted characteristics. In insisting on recurrence, the writer forgets that on the supposition of progress in a spiral, this is subsidiary and temporary. The main and permanent direction of progress is that of the axis of the spiral. The augmentation of knowledge has been going on continuously in the modern world. Even in pointing out that there has been a recurrence from the state in which capital is the dominant element in industry to that in which labour dominates, Arduino does not suggest that the still earlier situation in which nature was dominant, will ever recur.

Raffaele Guariglia: "Il capitalismo" di A. Labriola. A criticism of this work. Economic histories may be divided into two classes. The one is an impartial and objective account of the facts. This is difficult in a subject which provokes so much difference of opinion and is usually dull. The other, to which Labriola's work belongs, and of which Marx is a leading example, openly aims at making history serve a particular end; and such history is far more stimulating in its enthusiasm than a mere collection of facts.

G. Toniolo: "Italica Gens." The immense emigration from Italy is spread over the whole of America. English emigrants find themselves for the most part within the British Empire or the great English-speaking Republic of the United States. Italian emigrants are all outside of the Italian dominion, and scattered in States of non-Italian origin. Therefore it is proposed to found a great society to maintain the connection of the exiles with the motherland, to support and succour them in the land of their adoption, and to bring them into communication with one another.

Fasc. ccviii (April, 1910). Ugo Gu'da: "Le leghe sociali di compratori." Consumption and not production being the true end of industry, the consumer and not the producer should be the dominant power. But the single consumer is weak and ignorant. Hence it is desirable that consumers should join together. The interest of consumers is really that of the public, and these consumers' leagues will be in a position to follow the advice of Ruskin by enquiring into the conditions of production and insisting on a fair wage for the workers.

Orazio Premoli : "Il duello nella pubblica opinione." An account of the movement against duelling in Italy, and of the support it should receive from legislation, from the Church, from philosophy and from public opinion. Three letters from St. Charles Borromeo are printed. It is suggested by the writer of the article that Courts of Honour should be established.

Giuseppe Menotti De Francesco : "I conflitti di lavoro e loro pacifica risoluzione." Strikes, their causes and effects, and the methods of avoiding them, conciliation, arbitration, and judicial decision—in Italy and abroad.

G. Toniolo : "L'odierno problema della famiglia nell' aspetto sociale." Among the causes that have weakened the Christian Family are erroneous Sociology, such as (1) tracing the Family, not to Divine institution, but to a gradual evolution through Polyandry and Polygamy; (2) Feminism; and (3) the theory that the State is responsible for the education of the young; and as a consequence the provision of public schools at which attendance is compulsory. But the Family has also been weakened by changes in practical life, more especially the work of women in factories. It is curious that the writer in his all-embracing commination, includes and even connects the Socialists and the Malthusians, although they are notoriously hostile. The general tone of the article is rather that of a sermon or a clerical manifesto than that of a sociological study.

Fasc. ccix (May, 1910). Carlo Grilli : "La rendita edilizia nelle moderne metropoli." A consideration of the elements of rest in great cities.

Giuseppe Menotti De Francesco : "I conflitti di lavoro e loro pacifica risoluzione." An account of the legislation in many countries on industrial arbitration, both optional and compulsory.

Ugo Guida : "Origine, costituzione e scopi delle leghe sociali di compratori in America ed in Europa." An account of the Leagues of Consumers in many countries.

Fasc. ccx (June, 1910). Ugo Guida : "L'efficienza delle leghe sociali di compratori." A report of the International Conference of the Leagues of Consumers held at Geneva in September, 1908. To this are added some criticisms on the efficacy and legitimacy of the leagues. The leagues consider many things, the consumer only one; he will buy the cheapest article of any particular quality. To this it is answered that he should consider not only his economic interest, but his physical and social interest also. Secondly the leagues seek to introduce artificial correctives instead of relying on the natural order, summarised in the maxim "*laissez faire, laissez faire*." The consumer has only the right to buy or not to buy. On the contrary it is argued that it is the consumer who really pays the workers, and is responsible, if they are treated unfairly. Thirdly, it is illegitimate for the buyer, a third party, to interpose between the capitalist and his workmen. But here again the consumer is ultimately responsible. As regards the leagues' proposed means of action, the attempt to interfere between capitalist and workman, would lead to tale-bearing and delation, the "white list" cannot be equally applied to all, and the "white list" virtually contains a "black list." But "Purveyor to His Majesty," and such designations, constitute a "white list," which the traders themselves publish.

Carlo Grilli : "La rendita edilizia nelle moderne metropoli." The growth and conditions of great modern cities.

Giuseppe Menotti De Francesco : "I conflitti di lavoro e loro pacifica risoluzione." Compulsory arbitration in Australia and its impossibility in Italy.

Paolo Cesare Rinaldo : "Una capitale cristiano-sociale." An interesting account of the work of Dr. Lueger, the late Burgomaster of Vienna.



## REVISTA ITALIANA DI SOCIOLOGIA.

Anno xiv, Fasc. ii (March—April, 1910). V. Miceli: "Le leggi di associazione mentale nel dominio del diritto." Mental association enters into the domain of law in many subjects, but especially in all forms of association and collective responsibility. By mental association, sometimes the whole is considered as existing for the benefit of the part, sometimes the part for the benefit of the whole, and so in other cases.

E. Levasseur: "Intorno all' istruzione primaria." The history and present state of primary education in France.

C. Gini: "I presupposti statistici della teoria della cernita naturale." A study of natural selection based on the statistics of Karl Pearson and of those who have followed his method. The statistics are not considered from the point of view of the Mendelian theory of heredity, and the paper is in consequence much reduced in value. Mendel is ignored throughout.

A. Bruno: "Sociologia e psicologia." A study of the relations between Sociology and Psychology, in continuation of an article (Fasc. ii, 1909) on the conditions of the existence of Sociology.

---

## ARCHIV FÜR RASSEN-UND GESELLSCHAFTS-BIOLOGIE. Vol. vii.

Heft 2. (March and April). Dr. E. Becher: "Theoretische Beiträge zur Darwinismus." A general review of Darwinism dealing with design, selection and vitalism as explanations in natural investigation. Dr. V. Franz: "Die Laichwanderungen der Fische" shows that the preservation of the species is the impulse accountable for the spawning journeys of fishes. Dr. Gnassl has a long article on child-mortality from the race standpoint. Dr. Hans Fehlinger discusses the evolution of the human family.

---

## VIERTELJAHRSSCHRIFT FÜR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE PHILOSOPHIE UND

SOZIOLOGIE. 1910, Heft 1. Karl Marbe: "Beiträge zur Logik und ihren Gewissenschaften. (Nos. 4 and 5.) These treat of the theory of relation and the function of logic, of the rules of probability and induction with the laws of error, etc. Hans Kleinpeter: "Die phänomenologische Naturanschauung und der philosophische Realismus." A reconsideration of Physics in the light of modern thought; summarizes the history of psychology as developed by recent philosophers, Stumpf and Külpe. Paul Barth: "Die Geschichte der Erziehung in soziologische Beleuchtung" (No. 12.) explains how the state became divorced from the church in the national organisation of education, which it took over as a commission after the Reformation. The contributions of such men as Milton and Locke, Turgot, Condorcet, and Comte to religious tolerance are lucidly described.

---

## BULLETIN MENSUEL.

The Brussels Institute of Sociology (Institut Solvay) has begun a new enterprise by the publication of the "Bulletin Mensuel," under the direction of M. Emile Waxweiler. We learn from the Director's prefatory announcement that the intention is to give the Bulletin largely the character of an annotated bibliography. The five numbers so far received (January—May) contain a number of brief reviews, a monthly chronicle of sociological activity, and a classified list of publications.

REVUE INTERNATIONALE DE SOCIOLOGIE, March. L. M. Billia: "Pourquoi le libre échange n'est pas populaire." A. Bochart: "L'évolution de la fortune de l'Etat." April—Scipio Sighele: "Les libéricides," a detailed examination of the various forms of infanticide in European countries, the pathological causes, and a discussion of the remedies.

---

REVUE DE METAPHYSIQUE ET DE MORALE (May). B. Russell: "La théorie des types logiques." H. Daudin: "F. Rauh—Sa psychologie de la connaissance et de l'action."

---

Also Received:—

La Lectura Revistade Ciencias y de Artes; Man; The Open Court; Progress; La Science Sociale; Le Musée Social (Annales and Mémoires).

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

- Frazer, J. G. "Totemism and Exogamy." 4 Vols. Macmillan & Co. 50/- net.
- Thomas, W. I. "Source Book of Social Origins." University of Chicago Press. \$4.77.
- Chart, D. A. "Ireland from the Union to Catholic Emancipation." J. M. Dent & Sons. 6/- net.
- Croce, Benedetto. (Translated by Henry Buriot.) "Ce qui est vivant et ce que est mort de la Philosophie de Hegel." Giard et Brière. 5 francs.
- Rowntree, B. Seebohm. "Life and Labour: Lessons from Belgium." Macmillan & Co. 10/6 net.
- Kelly, M. "Kant's Ethics and Schopenhauer's Criticism." Swan, Sonnenschein & Co. 2/6.
- Abbot, Edith. "Women in Industry." D. Appleton & Co. \$2.00 net.
- Bochard, A. "L'Evolution de la Fortune de l'Etat." Giard et Brière. 6 and 7 francs.
- Sighele, Scipio. "Le Crime à Deux." Giard et Brière. 4 and 5 francs.
- Talbot, Marion. "The Education of Women." University of Chicago Press. \$1.25 net.
- Harper, Dr. J. Wilson. "The Church and Social Betterment." A. & C. Black. 1/- net.
- Ashbee, C. R. "The Building of Thelema." J. M. Dent & Sons. 4/6 net.
- Howard, G. E. "Social Psychology: an Analytical and Reference Syllabus." University of Nebraska.
- Loch, C. S. "Charity and Social Life." Macmillan & Co. 6/- net.
- Appleton, L. Estelle. "A Comparative Study of the Play Activities of Adult Savages and Civilised Children." University of Chicago Press. 54 cents.
- Cosentini, F. "Il Socialismo Guiridico." Cav. Niccolo Giannotta.
- D'Aeth, F.G. "Report to the Chairman of the Liverpool Council of Voluntary Aid on the Charitable Effort in Liverpool." The Council of Voluntary Aid. 1/-.

## PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

### THE SOCIAL ASPECTS OF ART.

On April 12 Mr. W. Rothenstein lectured on this subject, the chair being taken by Mr. C. R. Ashbee. The lecturer dealt with the relation of the artist to society, pointing out that under present conditions no demand was made upon the artist for what he is best able to give, while the community was unaware of what it might and should obtain in the way of public service from the artist. He lived for the most part to flatter the accidental attributes of the prosperous classes. We were more and more losing sight of the truth that the artist's real work in the community was to keep men alive to beauty, justice, and dignity. The final and essential test was whether the student was to learn to produce seemly and inspiring things for the people's daily use, or whether we were to go on thinking that such things as sculpture and oil-painting were alone worthy of the name of art.

---

### THE AGRARIAN REVOLUTION IN IRELAND.

On April 26 the Right Hon. Sir Horace Plunkett read the paper on "Sociological Aspects of the Agrarian Revolution in Ireland" which appears in this number. Mr. Robert Yerburgh, M.P., was in the chair.

---

### ENGLISH RURAL SOCIETY.

On May 24 Professor Hermann Levy of Heidelberg University delivered a lecture on "English Rural Society, its Structure and Changes," Mr. Swinny presiding. The lecturer examined the principal changes brought about in England during the period of the industrial revolution and the application of the Enclosure Acts, discussed the effect of the abolition of the Corn Laws upon agriculture, and dwelt at length upon the characteristics of the modern period, dating from about 1875, especially with regard to small holdings and co-operation.